

JPRS-TAC-85-005

23 April 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

23 April 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

Bill Would Prevent Nuclear Arms Importation in Finland (Editorial; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 1 Mar 85)	1
France's 6th Nuclear Missile-Launching Sub Enters Service (LE MONDE, 3 Apr 85)	3
Romania Calls on U.S., USSR To Halt Arms Race (XINHUA, 30 Mar 85)	4
Poland's Foreign Minister on Arms Control (Stefan Olszowski; RZECZPOSPOLITA, 15 Mar 85)	5
USSR Official Holds Disarmament Talks With Australia (Melbourne Overseas Service, various dates)	8
Arrival, Agenda Reported	8
Talks Begin	8
Talks End	9
Australian Disarmament Policy Gaining Acceptance (Melbourne Overseas Service, 25 Mar 85)	10
Mass Antinuclear Rallies Held in Australia (XINHUA, 31 Mar 85)	11
Mexican, Argentine Presidents Condemn Arms Race (XINHUA, 28 Mar 85)	12
U.S. Concerned About WEU Defense Coordination (XINHUA, 2 Apr 85)	13
Foreign Ministry Spokesman Holds Weekly Briefing (XINHUA, 10 Apr 85)	14
Responsibility for Nuclear Arming of Pakistan Assessed (Editorial; PATRIOT, 27 Feb 85)	15

U.S. Plan To Deploy Nuclear Weapons in Philippines Disclosed (Ellen Tordesillas; ANG PAHAYAGANG MALAYA, 17 Mar 85) ...	17
Philippine Government Urged To Oppose Plan (Ben Evardone; ANG PAHAYAGANG MALAYA, 18 Mar 85)	19
Marcos Urged To Oppose U.S. Plan for Warheads (Vicente B. Foc, Marcia C. Rodriguez; BULLETIN TODAY, 19 Mar 85)	20
No Nonproliferation Until Superpowers Wish It (Editorial; HONGKONG STANDARD, 1 Mar 85)	21
Commentary Views Soviet 'Freeze' Proposal (XINHUA, 3 Apr 85)	22
Commentary Views U.S. Proposal, Debate on MX (Beijing Domestic Service, 29 Mar 85)	24
PRC Delegate on Nuclear Disarmament, World Strife (XINHUA, 27 Mar 85)	26
U.S. Allies Express Antinuclear Sentiments (Beijing in English to East and South Africa, 10 Mar 85)	27
Briefs Hayden on Test Ban Verification	28
U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS	
Adelman Said To Fuel Campaign To Discredit USSR Policy (PRAVDA, 29 Mar 85)	29
Warsaw Views Resumption of U.S.-USSR Arms Talks (PAP, various dates; Warsaw Domestic Service, 8, 10 Jan 85)	30
Preview of Shultz-Gromyko Talks, by Edward Dylawski	30
Shultz-Gromyko First Round, by Krzysztof Wojna	31
Joint Statement Noted	31
Agreement 'Good Sign', by Edward Dylawski	32
Press Views Talks	32
Reagan Press Conference, by Maksymilian Berezowski	33
'Success' of Shultz-Gromyko Talks	34
Gromyko News Conference	35
Gromyko Comments, U.S. Response	36
Need for Compromise, by Andrezej Rayzacher	37
Czechoslovakia Views Geneva Talks Hopefully (PRAVDA, 9 Mar 85; CTK, 12 Mar 85)	38
Christian Peace Group Cited	38
Success Could Revive Detente	38
Opening of Talks Reported	39

Prague Emphasizes Purpose, Proper Format of Talks (CTK, 11 Mar 85)	40
GUANGMING RIBAO Assesses Geneva Arms Control Talks (Wang Ling, De Xin; GUANGMING RIBAO, 10 Mar 85)	41
CHINA DAILY on U.S. 'Patience, Strength, Unity' at Geneva (Chen Si; CHINA DAILY, 13 Mar 85)	44
Reagan Accuses USSR of Treaty Violations (XINHUA, 19 Mar 85)	46
PRAVDA Criticizes U.S. as 'Unhelpful' at Talks (XINHUA, 17 Mar 85)	47
USSR Arms Negotiator on U.S. Stance at Talks (XINHUA, 17 Mar 85)	48
Ceausescu Hopes for Success of Geneva Talks (XINHUA, 15 Mar 85)	49
NATO Official Cited on U.S.-USSR Arms Talks (XINHUA, 11 Mar 85)	50
Several UN Envoys Urge Superpower Arms Curbs (XINHUA, 16 Mar 85)	51

SPACE ARMS

French Military Strategist Supports SDI Research (Marc Geneste Interview; LE FIGARO MAGAZINE, 23-29 Mar 85)	52
Mitterrand Meets With Gorbachev 13 Mar (Paris Domestic Service, 13 Mar 85; AFP, 14 Mar 85) ...	56
Foresees No Change in Policy	56
Gorbachev 'Calm, Sharp, Subtle'	56
LE MONDE Views U.S.-USSR Arms Talks in Geneva (Michel Tatu; LE MONDE, 10-11 Mar 85)	57
HANDELSBLAD: U.S. 'Ultimatum' Highlights SDI Contradictions (Editorial; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 28 Mar 85)	60
Rotterdam Commentator on SDI Technological Spinoffs (J. L. Heldring; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 22 Feb 85)	62
Norway's Labor Party Youth Congress: Change NATO Nuclear Strategy (AFTENPOSTEN, 23, 25 Feb 85)	65
Departing Chairman Gives Views, by Thorleif Andreassen	65
Incoming Chairman Against NATO-Membership	66

Resolution Supports 'Zone'	67
Conservative Chairman Condemns Resolution	67
Andreotti on Meeting With Gorbachev (Giulio Andreotti Interview; LA REPUBBLICA, 17-18 Mar 85)	69
L'UNITA Views Craxi Visit to Washington (Romano Ledda; L'UNITA, 9 Mar 85)	71
PCI Aide Says SDI Means 'Certain Escalation' (Gianluca Devoto; L'UNITA, 20 Mar 85)	72
Academics Write on SDI in European Papers (L'UNITA, 12 Mar 85; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 12 Mar 85)	74
Aleksey Arbatov in L'UNITA, by Aleksey Arbatov	74
Bogdanov in Dutch Paper	76
Leuschner on U.S. 'Star Wars' (East Berlin Domestic Service, 25 Feb 85)	78
Premises, FRG Support of SDI Criticized (Karl-Eduard von Schnitzler; East Berlin Television Service, 18 Mar 85)	80
PRC Warns of Space War at Disarmament Talks (XINHUA, 27 Mar 85)	82
XINHUA Analyzes European Views of 'Star Wars' Plan (XINHUA, 25 Mar 85)	83
West Europeans Ponder Participation in 'Star Wars' (Xia Ximian; XINHUA, 1 Apr 85)	84
Briefs	
SDI Stance	86
No to 'Star Wars'	86
Arms Document Given to USSR	86
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
USSR Rumored 'Willing' To Discuss SS-20's With Netherlands (AFP, 23 Mar 85)	87
Parliament Discusses Belgian Missile Deployment (NRC HANDELSBLAD, 21 Mar 85)	88
Martens Statement to Parliament on Cruise Decision (Martens; Brussels Domestic Service, 15 Mar 85)	89
Party Daily Attacks Kohl's Deployment Decision (NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 23-24 Feb 85)	91

U.S. 'Demagoguery' on MX Missiles Criticized (Jan Gadowski, Andrzej Walasek; Warsaw Domestic Service, 21 Mar 85)	93
--	----

XINHUA Roundup on Belgium's Missile Decision (XINHUA, 16 Mar 85)	95
---	----

Belgian Demonstrators Protest Missile Deployment (XINHUA, 18 Mar 85)	97
---	----

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

Paper Comments on Country's Stand on Nordic Zone (Editorial; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 1 Mar 85)	98
--	----

RENMIN RIBAO on Stockholm Disarmament Conference (Liu Xumin; RENMIN RIBAO, 22 Mar 85)	100
--	-----

Polish Delegate on USSR Proposal, U.S. Reaction (Andrzej Rayzacher; PAP, 30 Jan 85)	102
--	-----

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Israelyan Contrasts USSR, U.S. Stands on Space Arms (TASS, 26 Mar 85; Moscow World Service, 26 Mar 85)	104
---	-----

TASS Correspondent	104
Moscow Radio	105

GDR Envoy Addresses Geneva Disarmament Conference (NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 20 Feb 85)	106
---	-----

CSCE Delegate Urges Chemical Weapons Freeze (ADN, 18 Mar 85)	107
---	-----

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

35th Session of Vienna MBFR Talks Ends (Various sources, 28 Mar 85)	108
--	-----

Session Ends	108
Delegates' Comments Reported	108
Next Round Starts 23 May	109

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. Chemical Arms Production Contradicts Stance on Ban (Moscow World Service, 1 Mar 85)	110
---	-----

U.S. 'Constantly Violates' Toxic Weapons Convention (TASS, 26 Mar 85)	112
Dutch View Tactics, Protection Against Chemical Warfare (LEGERKOERIER, Jan 85)	113
Italy Views Development, Possession, Use of CB Weapons (Almerico Di Meglio; IL MATTINO, 18 Feb 85)	116
SED, SPD Officials Resume Chemical Weapons Talks (ADN, 28 Feb 85; DPA, 1 Mar 85)	120
Bonn Meeting	120
'Significant Advances' Reported	121
U.S. Production of Chemical Weapons Assailed (Wolfgang Lehmann; Voice of GDR, 14 Mar 85)	122

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Reportage on New Zealand Ship Ban, ANZUS Row (THE PRESS, 2 Jan 85; THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, 26 Jan 85)	124
Lange Says 'Pressure' Prompts U.S.-USSR Talks	124
Nakasone Urges Lange To Reconsider, by David Jenkins	124
Australian Left Opposes Hawke Pressure, by Rod Frail	126
Canberra Reaction To Failure of UN Nuclear Free Panel (THE EVENING POST, 11 Feb 85)	128

GENERAL

BILL WOULD PREVENT NUCLEAR ARMS IMPORTATION IN FINLAND

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 1 Mar 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Foreign Nuclear Weapons To Be Illegal"]

[Text] The government's nuclear energy bill presented to parliament contains a noteworthy point, which touches upon the heated security policy debate on nuclear weapons of a couple years ago: the importing of foreign nuclear weapons into Finland will be made illegal.

In connection with the so-called soothsayer debate it became publicly confirmed that in fact there is no legal agreement which would prohibit the deployment of nuclear weapons on Finnish territory for the benefit of a foreign country. No such obstacle is included in the Paris Peace Treaty or in the 1968 nuclear ban treaty. It prohibits the deployment of nuclear weapons remaining under the control of the nuclear states on the territory of another state.

President Mauno Koivisto wanted to conclude the debate at that time by declaring at the closing ceremonies of parliament that Finland will not permit nuclear weapons to be imported to its territory. Koivisto repeated his position at the UN General Assembly and in this way emphasized that Finland's nuclear-free status is "complete in the full sense of the word". However, he admitted in connection with a newspaper interview that "looked at from legal point of view nuclear weapons could be deployed on our territory in certain prescribed instances". The issue is not changed by the fact that in 1962 already the Finnish Government informed the secretary general of the UN in appealing to its neutrality that it will refuse to accept nuclear weapons on its territory for any country's benefit.

President Koivisto labeled the whole debate as purely a matter of legal theory and insulting to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has never taken a stand on the issue or on Koivisto's statements. According to experts, the Soviet Union should not have an actual need for placing nuclear weapons on Finnish soil even in a possible crisis situation. In connection with a Nordic nuclear-free zone it has also offered to give guarantees concerning the issue.

Even though political obstacles to the importing of foreign nuclear weapons to Finland are quite forceful, the creation of legal obstacles has also been seen

as important. The promotion of a nuclear-free zone serves these objectives in part.

A ban contained in our own nuclear energy legislation is one step in this direction even if it does not carry the same weight as a treaty between states. In any case there is a desire to make it clear that the nuclear weapons of foreign states cannot be imported to our country according to the laws of Finland -- not even in connection with short naval visits.

10576

CSO: 3617/86

GENERAL

FRANCE'S 6TH NUCLEAR MISSILE-LAUNCHING SUB ENTERS SERVICE

PMO31619 Paris LE MONDE in French 3 Apr 85 p 10

[Unattributed report: "Sixth Nuclear Missile-Launching Submarine for Ile-Longue Base"]

[Text] Following its official delivery to the Navy at the start of this week, the nuclear missile-launching submarine Inflexible is to receive its 16 M-14 missiles and is due to go into service in 4-6 weeks' time. Following its launch in 1982 the Inflexible has undergone a series of sea trials under the Directorate for Construction and Naval Weapons of the general delegation for armaments. At its Ile-Longue base it joins the five existing nuclear missile-launching submarines, the Redoubtable, the Terrible, the Foudroyant, the Indomitable, and the Tonnat, which entered service between December 1971 and April 1980 and each of which carries 16 M-20 missiles armed with one-megaton thermonuclear warheads (five times as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb).

Different in many respects from these five submarines, the Inflexible will launch a new missile, the M-4, which is capable of delivering up to six 150-kiloton warheads over a distance of 4,000 km. These thermonuclear charges would be dispersed over an area equivalent to that extending between Paris and Rouen or Paris and Orleans. With its 96 warheads the Inflexible boasts a destructive capability equal to that of the other five submarines together (which combine a total of 80 warheads). By 1992 all these submarines except the first, the Redoubtable, will be increased (to about 5,000 km) and whose warhead will be modified (made lighter and miniaturized).

CSO: 5200/2546

GENERAL

ROMANIA CALLS ON U.S., USSR TO HALT ARMS RACE

OW300830 Beijing XINHUA in English 0709 GMT 30 Mar 85

[Text] Bucharest, 29 Mar (XINHUA)--Romania's reelected President Nicolae Ceausescu today appealed to the whole world to make common efforts to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament.

Speaking at the first session of the 9th Grand National Meeting, the president said the present world situation is grave as the nuclear arms race is riding up. The danger of a new world war is rising and likely to lead to a nuclear disaster, he noted.

On the Soviet-U.S. talks going on in Geneva, he said Romania, like other countries in the world, welcomes the start of the negotiations. However, the beginning of the talks does not mean the end of the menacing problems. Romania hopes there would be sincere, responsible and real negotiations.

The president said a halt to the U.S. nuclear missile deployment in Western Europe and the Soviet counter-measures is the requisite for the success of the Geneva talks.

He pointed out that continuing the deployment of nuclear weapons and piling up highly destructive new weapons under the disguise of negotiations is a trick to appease public opinion and step up the arms race.

A letter of appeal was unanimously carried at the session this evening to the parliaments of the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada and European countries. It urges the United States and the Soviet Union to stop, during the Geneva talks, the testing and production of new-type nuclear weapons, the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles and Soviet counter-measures, as well as the militarization of space. This will create an atmosphere favorable to the talks, the letter says.

CSO: 5200/4015

GENERAL

POLAND'S FOREIGN MINISTER ON ARMS CONTROL

AU212301 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 15 Mar 85 pp 3-4

[Speech by Foreign Minister Stefan Olszowski at the 14 March Sejm session in Warsaw: "The Current Problems of Foreign Policy"]

[Excerpts]

May it please the Sejm: We deem the international situation within which we must conduct Polish foreign policy to be still difficult and dangerous. For years now a state of tension, mainly between East and West, and an accumulation of dangerous trends and phenomena have been its characteristic features. Their main source has been and remains the confrontational policy of the United States and of certain other NATO states that support the cold war policy of Washington, which aims at changing the strategic balance of forces in the world.

The Western policy of confrontation continues to affect almost all spheres of international life as well as large-scale activities in armaments, economics, policy, propaganda, and ideology. Its most dangerous features are the increased speed of the arms race, the new generations of nuclear and conventional weapons, and the extremely dangerous plans for militarization of space.

The continued deployment as of 1983 of new American nuclear systems in some West European countries is a direct threat to the socialist states' security. The counter-measures that the USSR took last year in agreement with the GDR and the CSSR have restored the balance, but the nuclear armaments promoted by NATO states in Europe have been raised to a higher level.

New armaments programs promoted by the United States and NATO stretch beyond the year 2000 and are a source of constant tension. Increasing armament is expected to lead not only to achieving strategy-military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact, but also to complicating the economic development of the socialist countries.

That Washington is seeking to undermine the balance of forces is attested to by the extremely dangerous program for so-called space armaments. This program, which is to cost many billions of dollars, has been innocently termed the Strategic Defense Initiative. The fact is that this initiative is to ensure for the United States the ability to deliver a nuclear first strike and to deprive the USSR of the possibility to respond. This is bound to affect the comprehensive negotiations on nuclear and space armaments between the USSR and the United States that began in Geneva on 12 March.

The PPR has welcomed these negotiations and supports the Soviet position. We expect that the negotiations will be difficult and long, but we think that they may create conditions for an accord and for improving the relations between the two great powers, which bear particular responsibility for preserving peace. This would improve East-West relations.

The policy of confrontation and militarization followed by the United States and some NATO countries has created dangers in Europe.

The Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Agreements have been falsely interpreted. A myth has been created to the effect that the allied decisions on which the peaceful postwar European order was based have divided Europe, although it is a historical fact that this division was created by the aggressive NATO bloc and by the admission of the FRG into it.

The purpose of the manipulations concerning the 40th anniversary of the Yalta conference is to interfere within the domestic affairs of the socialist countries, to question territorial and political facts, and to intensify the support for the anti-socialist opposition. The demagogic slogans proclaimed by the present and former Western politicians to the effect that "the Yalta heritage should be eliminated" and that "the artificial division of Europe should be done away with" are a screen for the programs in line with which the socialist countries should be subjected to subversive activities from without and within. These slogans are also a blow against the CSCE Final Act, which must not be detached from the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements. Attempts at such actions are also directed against the PPR, but we continue resolutely to repulse them.

Although shots can still be heard in the various regions of our globe and although imperialism has waged its dirty wars to stem the national liberation and revolutionary processes, the postwar period has been saved from a global conflict. This period has been a period of peace in Europe, the first such long period of peace in centuries.

This has been possible because of the shift of forces in favor of socialism, democracy, and worldwide peace, because of the increased might and importance of the USSR, because of the consistent peace policy of the USSR and other socialist countries, because of the peace-loving forces in the world, and because of the international communist and workers movement.

Honorable Sejm: Poland's security also depends on efforts to strengthen the mechanisms of international cooperation, which include the United Nations on the global scale and the CSCE process on the regional scale. The CSCE process is a result of the efforts of the socialist countries above all. That is why CSCE meetings that will be held in 1985 -- the meeting of experts on human rights in Ottawa and the cultural forum in Budapest -- will be such important areas of our activities.

We view with sympathy Finland's proposal that a political meeting to mark the 10th anniversary of the CSCE Final Act be held in Helsinki.

We will continue to pay a great deal of attention to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. We support the draft treaty on mutual nonuse of military force and on the preservation of peaceful relations. This draft, which was put forward recently at the Stockholm conference by the USSR, is based on the proposal contained in the Prague Declaration of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. We think that the Stockholm conference should begin specific negotiations as soon as possible in the working groups set up at the end of last year.

At the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, the PPR and the other socialist countries participating in these negotiations are making efforts to render an agreement possible. Unlike the Western countries, which are not showing any readiness to reduce their armed forces, together with our allies we backed the draft, that was put forward by the USSR last February and that contains the basic decisions on an accord on the initial reduction of the Soviet and American land forces as well as of armaments in central Europe and, subsequently, on the reduction of the level of the armed forces and armaments of the sides in this region.

At the Geneva disarmament conference of 40 countries, together with our allies and nonaligned and neutral countries we continue efforts aimed at having genuine negotiations on all crucial issues -- preventing nuclear war, promoting nuclear disarmament, completely banning nuclear tests, preventing the militarization of space, and eliminating chemical weapons.

The Polish representative has become for the second time the chairman of the committee for banning chemical weapons. His responsibility is to make every effort to achieve real progress in the work on a convention in this matter.

CSO: 5200/10

GENERAL

USSR OFFICIAL HOLDS DISARMAMENT TALKS WITH AUSTRALIA

Arrival, Agenda Reported

BK191254 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1230 GMT 19 Mar 85

[Text] A senior official of the Soviet Union arrived in Canberra today for disarmament talks with the Australian Government. Mr Valdimir Petrovskiy, the head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's International Organizations Department, will have 2 or 3 days of discussions including a meeting with the foreign minister, Mr Hayden. Australia's ambassador for disarmament, Mr Richard Butler, has returned to Canberra from Geneva to take part in the talks.

The discussions will cover the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the comprehensive test ban concept, chemical and biological weapons, and the current negotiations in Geneva on nuclear weapons and arms in space.

The United States is due to send a senior official to Canberra for similar talks at a date to be fixed. The Australian Government arranged the separate exchange of views on disarmament with the Soviet Union and the United States at the end of last year.

Talks Begin

BK200504 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 20 Mar 85

[Text] A Soviet delegation has begun talks in Canberra on a range of disarmament issues -- the first such bilateral talks between the Soviet Union and Australia. At the outset of 3 days of negotiations, the head of the Soviet delegation, Dr Vladimir Petrovskiy, declared there was good ground between Australia and the Soviet Union in opposition to the spread of the arms race to outer space.

Dr Petrovskiy, the head of the Soviet foreign Ministry's International Organizations Department, was greeted by the foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, in Canberra. Mr Hayden said Australia had sought the exchange of views with the Soviet Union to make an independent contribution to the cause of disarmament. In reply, Dr Petrovskiy said he hoped the dialogue would produce a little modest step forward.

Radio Australia's Canberra correspondent, Walter Hamilton, says Dr Petrovskiy stressed a number of times the Soviet Union's interest in preventing the deployment of weapons in space -- a crucial issue at the Soviet-American talks now under way in Geneva. Dr Petrovskiy reminded Mr Hayden that both Australia and the Soviet Union had voted in the United Nations to stop the arms race in outer space.

Our correspondent says Australia will host similar talks with the United States delegation later this year.

Talks End

BK220920 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 22 Mar 85

[Text] Australia is to have a further round of talks on disarmament with the Soviet Union to follow up discussions held in Canberra over the past 3 days. The leader of the Australian delegation at the initial talks, the deputy secretary of the Foreign Affairs Department, Mr Duncan Campbell, said there had been a full and genuine exchange of views. Issues covered included a comprehensive nuclear test ban, reducing nuclear arsenals, preventing an arms race in space, and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

Mr Campbell said that the Soviet delegation, led by Mr Vladimir Petrovskiy, had proposed a second series of talks in Moscow in about a year, and this would be taken up. Mr Campbell said Australia had been recognized as having something valuable to say on disarmament.

This week's talks mainly dealt with the comprehensive test ban issue. Mr Campbell said some Soviet responses suggested there were new elements which deserved to be included in the test ban debate in Geneva. Australia's disarmament talks with the Soviet Union would be followed by a similar dialogue with a U.S. delegation in Canberra later in the year.

CSO: 5200/4308

GENERAL

AUSTRALIAN DISARMAMENT POLICY GAINING ACCEPTANCE

BK251447 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1110 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the "Australian Insight" program]

[Excerpts] Australia has been playing a prominent role in arms reductions efforts since the election of the Hawke Labor government 2 years ago. Its high profile in arms negotiations is indicated by its appointment of Mr Richard Butler as Australia's ambassador for disarmament. Last week, Australian officials held disarmament talks with a senior Soviet official in Canberra, and in a later public meeting, the Soviet official, Dr Vladimir Petrovskiy, had some strong words to say about the development of the so-called Star Wars space weapons. This report from John Lombard in Canberra:

[Begin Lombard recording] The Australian labor government has been quite firm on the Star Wars proposal by the American administration. It is against it. Under the plan announced by President Reagan last year, the Americans are undertaking research into laser weapons that would operate from outer space to hit Soviet missiles fired at the United States.

But the Australian position is for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, what's known as a CTB that would, quite simply, stop all testings by all nations in all environment. Mr Richard Butler has been leading the Australian approach in arms talks in Geneva, and by all reports, he has been quite successful. What has become known, then, as the Australian approach is beginning to get a much wider acceptance. This involves a comprehensive treaty with verification, and that means an international seismic data network, a remote control black-box monitoring system, an international atmospheric monitoring network, and on-sight inspection.

The Australian approach was spelled out last week to the Soviet head of the Foreign Ministry's International Organizations Department, Dr Vladimir Petrovskiy, who led a delegation of Soviet experts on disarmament in talks in Canberra. Later, at a public meeting, Dr Petrovskiy referred to the Reagan star wars plan and gave the Soviet position. Moscow, he said, would be prepared to negotiate drastic reductions in strategic arms, if the development of space weapons was halted.

CSO: 5200/4308

GENERAL

MASS ANTINUCLEAR RALLIES HELD IN AUSTRALIA

OW311640 Beijing XINHUA in English 1626 GMT 31 Mar 85

[Text] Canberra, 31 Mar (XINHUA)--More than 300,000 Australians held peaceful demonstrations throughout the country today for nuclear disarmament.

In Canberra, more than 5,000 demonstrators marched from the city center to Parliament House and then went along the Commonwealth Avenue to the New Zealand High Commission, voicing their support to the New Zealand Government's refusal of entry of U.S. nuclear warships to its ports.

The biggest turnout of demonstrators, according to local radio broadcast, was in Sydney where 170,000 people including parliamentarians, youth groups and other people congregated at Hyde Park for the march led by New South Wales Premier Neville Wran through the main street. Children walked hand in hand with their parents. Also participating were teenagers and middle-aged couples.

In Melbourne, 100,000 demonstrators held banners and placards to protest against nuclear arms race.

In Adelaide, a crowd of 15,000 demonstrators gave a rousing welcome at the festival center to the keynote speaker, famous rock singer Peter Garrett. He had the crowd on their feet yelling when he said it was time for the people to say "no" to nuclear weapons. He also spoke against the monitoring of the U.S. MX missiles in Australia.

Similar demonstrations were also held today in Brisbane, Perth, Hobart and other cities.

In his statement issued here this afternoon, Australian Foreign Minister Bill Hayden said: "Throughout Australia today people are gathering to demonstrate their concern about the continuing arms race and particularly the nuclear arms race. This concern is entirely justified," and "that is why the government has consistently urged the superpowers to resume their nuclear arms reduction negotiations. It is my fervent hope that the dialogue which has now begun again between the superpowers will be put on a constructive and permanent footing."

CSO: 5200/4915

GENERAL

MEXICAN, ARGENTINE PRESIDENTS CONDEMN ARMS RACE

OW281443 Beijing XINHUA in English 1239 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Mexico City, 27 Mar (XINHUA)--The Mexican and Argentinian presidents today strongly condemned the intensifying arms race and the stockpiling of nuclear and conventional weapons.

In a joint communique, visiting Argentinian President Raul Alfonsin and Mexican President De la Madrid said they are worried by the aggravating, complicated and dangerous world situation and the threat posed by the arms race to world peace and security. They said they are also concerned over the various international conflicts threatening the peaceful coexistence between nations and over the increased tensions.

All conflicts should be settled by peaceful means, they said.

The two leaders reaffirmed their willingness to strive for the unity of Latin America.

Latin American nations should establish their relations on the basis of unity, cooperation, pluralism as well as respect for the principle of non-interference and for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Referring to the situation in Central America, the two presidents said the foreign military presence should be eliminated to avoid the use of forces and hostilities.

They urged the countries related to and with interest in this region not to take any actions likely to threaten peace in the region.

The two leaders also expressed the hope that Central American nations would facilitate the efforts made by the Contadora Group to promote the peace process in the region.

CSO: 5200/4015

GENERAL

U.S. CONCERNED ABOUT WEU DEFENSE COORDINATION

OWO2G747 Beijing XINHUA in English 0653 GMT 2 Apr 85

[Text] London, 2 Apr (XINHUA)--The U.S. administration has officially expressed its concern about attempts being made by European governments to coordinate their defense and arms control policies, according to the FINANCIAL TIMES today.

The paper disclosed that Richard Burt, senior U.S. State Department official in charge of European affairs, had sent a letter to the seven member governments of the Western European Union (WEU), cautioning them not to try to reach a common position on arms control matters outside the NATO framework.

The letter followed a meeting among senior foreign office officials of the seven WEU countries in Bonn in February, it said.

The seven governments decided last year to revive the WEU, established 30 years ago, in an effort to strengthen European defense cooperation. The foreign and defense ministers of the WEU will hold their first substantive meeting in Bonn on 22 and 23 April.

While the February session was preparatory to the April meeting, the paper said, it is believed to have discussed the possibility of institutionalizing defense cooperation at official level.

The paper quoted European officials as saying their February meeting had reached few conclusions. However, it said, "the issue has struck a raw nerve in the tense relations between Europe and the United States."

Some European officials believe, it added, the sharp U.S. response means Washington is prepared to see a revival of WEU only on its own terms, accepting that Europe should use the WEU as a means of improving its contribution to NATO's conventional defenses, but not as a vehicle for coordinating its policies on more sensitive issues like the controversial Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)--the "star wars" program.

However, the paper stressed, a number of European governments see such coordination as particularly important in the light of the recent U.S. invitation that they should participate in the 26 billion dollar research phase of SDI.

CSO: 5200/4015

GENERAL

FOREIGN MINISTRY SPOKESMAN HOLDS WEEKLY BRIEFING

OW100409 Beijing XINHUA in English 0356 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] Beijing, April 10 (XINHUA) -- A spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry reiterated here today China's hope that the Soviet Union and the United States would halt their experiment, production and deployment of nuclear weapons through serious negotiations.

The spokesman made this remark at a weekly press briefing here this morning while answering a question on China's reaction towards Soviet leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev's new proposal on arms control put forward on April 7.

The spokesman said that China had taken note of Gorbachev's new proposal as well as of the U.S. reaction towards it.

He noted that both the Soviet Union and the U.S. possessed the largest nuclear arsenals in the world. The international community hoped that they would halt their current round of fierce nuclear arms race.

"We hope that the two countries will, through serious negotiations, take practical measures to halt experiment, production and deployment of nuclear weapons, including strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons; and considerably reduce their nuclear arsenals," he said.

He pointed out that only by doing so, would it be possible to help reverse the dangerous trend of nuclear arms race and reduce the threat of a nuclear war.

CSO: 5200/4023

GENERAL

RESPONSIBILITY FOR NUCLEAR ARMING OF PAKISTAN ASSESSED

New Delhi PATRIOT in English 27 Feb 85 p 4

[Editorial]

[Text] When Pakistan acquires nuclear weapons capability--there is no if about it because all the indicators point inexorably to the creation of a nuclear weapon--several countries would have contributed to it. The Netherlands for being duped into taking in a Pakistani nuclear spy who fled with the secrets for the centrifugal method of uranium separation; the Swiss for supplying the equipment for pumping the gas in and out of the centrifuge; Canada for the machinery to spin the centrifuge at the desired speed and China for the design of nuclear warheads. All this has happened under the umbrella vigilance of the US which has, while paying lip service to nuclear non-proliferation, done precious little to stop its minions in Islamabad from pursuing a dream of having the bomb even, as the late Zulfikar Ali Bhutto put it, if Pakistanis had to eat grass for a thousand years. Without having to undergo any such rigour, thanks to the massive military and economic aid given by the US over the past six years, Pakistan is now on the verge of seeing the fruition of its dream. Reports indicate that the time is not far. The Israelis have computed that by 1986 Pakistan would be able to make 10 bombs equal in yield to those dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the US at the fag-end of World War II. Canadian police are believed to have unearthed records to show resemblance between the Pakistani nuclear programme and the US Manhattan Project which brought forth the first operational atomic bomb.

In the light of all this the revelation that the US has been soft on persons who have been caught red-handed for trying to acquire, on behalf of Pakistan, strategic equipment required mainly for the creation of a nuclear bomb is merely corroborative of the two-faced policy followed by Washington in this vital area. The offer of a nuclear umbrella to Pakistan made some time ago was more by way of making a gesture for public consumption than trying to stop Islamabad from pursuing its adventurist course. Pakistan has laid out a sophisticated network of agents in various countries to buy up equipment and despatch it home. If even in the face of evidence linking these agents to the Pakistan programme of nuclear weapons development the Governments of these countries treat their offences lightly, the conclusion is inescapable that there is an indirect nexus between Pakistan nuclear policy

and western strategic aims in this part of the world. The main concern is to ensure that the evidence does not lead directly to their own doorstep which is why the US moved to stop the export of nuclear triggers by Pakistani agents because such equipment is made only by US firms in the west.

As far as India is concerned, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's statement that this country would have to review its policy if Pakistan made the bomb and created a strategic imbalance in the region indicates the depth of its predicament. Clearly we are being pushed to the wall and the Government cannot but be concerned at the failure of Pakistan's friends to dissuade it from a course of action that will only add to the prevailing instability in the region. A bomb, irrespective of whether it is tested or not, will unleash a chain reaction of political events, a preview of which is already before us in the developments in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir.

CSO: 5250/0002

GENERAL

U.S. PLAN TO DEPLOY NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN PHILIPPINES DISCLOSED

HK250957 Quezon City ANG PAHAYAGANG MALAYA in English 17 Mar 85 pp 1, 8

[By Ellen Tordesillas]

[Text] The U.S. military establishment has been authorized by President Ronald Reagan to deploy nuclear weapons in the Philippines and seven other countries without informing their governments. This explosive information was contained in a secret report written by William M. Arkin, director of the Arms Race and Nuclear Weapons and Research Project, a copy of which was leaked yesterday to MALAYA by the Nuclear Free Philippines Coalition [NFPC].

Of the eight nations identified for nuclear weapons deployment as authorized by President Reagan, the Philippines has the most number of nuclear warheads in the breakdown cited by the Arkin report. It said 32 antisubmarine B-57 nuclear depth bombs, 80 other nuclear naval weapons of unspecified types and 115 more bombs, also of unspecified type, have been authorized for deployment in the Philippines, which is the site of the two biggest U.S. military installations outside the mainland.

A nuclear depth bomb, the report said, measures 15 feet long, weighs 510 pounds and has an explosive yield of about 10 kilotons (the Hiroshima bomb which caused the death of 70,000 within a month, had 13 kilotons yield). The report further said the nuclear depth bombs were first deployed by the U.S. Navy in 1967 and there are about 900 B-57 warheads in the U.S. arsenal today. An estimated 290 warheads have been deployed in 4 overseas bases in Britain, Guam and Italy while 560 are deployed at bases in the United States. The B-57's are to be used by land-based P-3 Orion planes, aircraft carriers, ship-based S-3 Viking planes and SH-3 helicopters, the report said. It further said that warheads deployed overseas are to supply main P-3 Orion bases, of which Cubi Point in Subic Base is one. The Orions can stay aloft for half a day without refueling and are used not only for rescue but mainly for submarine surveillance and tracking.

The authorized deployment of the nuclear weapons in the Philippines inevitably makes the country a logical target for a major Soviet nuclear attack in the event of an armed superpower conflict, Filipino nationalists opposed to the U.S. presence here pointed out. They also said that the projected nuclear buildup in the Philippines and the tiny Indian Ocean island of Diego Garcia could be a new U.S. move to counter the presence of the Soviets in Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay where retreating Americans left a major naval installation during the Vietnam War. It

is also known that SS-20 missiles aimed at Southeast Asia are deployed in Soviet Asia. Filipino nationalists, among them former Senators Lorenzo Tanada and Jose Diokno, have repeatedly warned that the presence of U.S. military bases here makes the Philippines a "natural magnet for a Soviet attack."

The secret report did not specify the reason for the nuclear warheads deployment in the Philippines nor did it say when the presidential authorization was given to the U.S. military. The 7 other countries or islands where deployment of the nuclear warheads had been authorized are the Azores, 32 warheads; Bermuda, 32; Canada, 32; Diego Garcia, 32; Iceland, 48; Puerto Rico, 32; and Spain, 32. The "peacetime" deployment is apparently part of a contingency plan of the U.S. military to cope with a major nuclear war. Information on their existence would be revealed to the host governments only in times of a "crisis," the report said.

Portions of the report have already appeared in the Canadian press. "The United States has a moral obligation to consult us when using our territory for something as emotional as nuclear weapons. It is an immoral attitude to make plans without consulting the countries involved," said retired Admiral Robert Falls, former chief of Canada's defense staff and chairman of NATO's military committee.

Last month former Senator Jovito Salonga disclosed that the U.S. military bases in the Philippines -- Clark Air Base in Pampanga and Subic Naval Base in Zambales -- hold the biggest arsenal of nuclear weapons in the Pacific. Salonga warned that "simple computer error or a miscalculation" could trigger off the "nuclear annihilation of 53 million Filipinos."

NFPC said that the Nuclear Weapons Deployment Plan is a secret memorandum approved by the U.S. President each year. It authorizes the deployment of nuclear weapons outside the U.S. and specifies which nuclear weapons can be deployed in which countries during peacetime, crisis and war. The plan, along with the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum, is one of the key documents the President approves each year to authorize the composition, deployment, production and retirement of warheads in the nuclear stockpile, NFPC said. The Deployment Plan is reportedly prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff after considering the requirements of the U.S. and specified commands. It is then transmitted to the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for approval, coordinated with the State Department and approved by the President.

NFPC said that "actually, the National Security Council staff and the assistant to the President for national security affairs sign the authorizations for the President." The U.S. Government has always maintained that "security policy regarding nuclear weapons locations is that it will neither confirm nor deny the existence or location of U.S. nuclear weapons located anywhere."

CSO: 5200/4307

GENERAL

PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT URGED TO OPPOSE PLAN

HK250935 Quezon City ANG PAHAYAGANG MALAYA in English 18 Mar 85 pp 1, 8

[Article by Ben Evardone]

[Excerpts] The Philippine Government was strongly urged yesterday to resist the plan of the United States to deploy nuclear weapons in two military bases here. Former Supreme Court Justice Jose B.L. Reyes, chairman of the Anti-Base Coalition (ABC), and Member of Parliament Aquilino Pimentel, Jr. (Opposition-Cagayan de Oro City) asked the Marcos government to protest against the plan of the U.S. saying "it will endanger the Filipino people because it will invite aggression from enemies of the United States."

Reyes also said the U.S. plan is a "violation" of the RP [Republic of the Philippines]-U.S. military bases agreement which, he said, prohibits the installation of nuclear weapons in the country without the knowledge and consent of the Philippine Government. Reyes said if the nuclear weapons were installed, this country would be among the first targets in a war, as it happened during World War Two when Japan bombed Clark Air Base in Pampanga.

A secret report of William M. Arkin, director of the Arms Race and Nuclear Weapons and Research Project, disclosed the U.S. plan to install nuclear warheads in the Philippines and 7 other countries without their knowledge. Commenting on the report which states the U.S. would not inform the Philippines on the plan, Pimentel said, "This is an indication that the Marcos regime is now being taken for granted by the Reagan administration."

Reyes and Pimentel said the Marcos government should lead the protest against the U.S. Government. They said this is a cause for alarm to the Filipino people because the installation of nuclear weapons will "heighten the invitation for nuclear attack."

Pimentel, together with former Senators Lorenzo M. Tanada, Jose W. Diokno, Jovito Salonga and Ramon V. Mitra, and Mrs. Cory Aquino, is a signatory to a declaration of principles calling, among others, for the dismantling of the U.S. bases here. They claim the U.S. bases in the country, the largest outside the U.S. mainland, violates Philippine territorial sovereignty.

CSO: 5200/4307

GENERAL

MARCOS URGED TO OPPOSE U.S. PLAN FOR WARHEADS

HK191437 Manila BULLETIN TODAY in English 19 Mar 85 p 1

[Article by Vicente B. Foz and Marcia C. Rodriguez]

[Excerpt] The government was asked yesterday to oppose a reported United States plan to deploy nuclear warheads in the Philippines. Member of Parliament Orlando S. Mercado (Opposition, Quezon City) filed a resolution in the Batasang Pambansa to urge President Marcos to resist any U.S. plan on the nuclear warheads.

A report by Director William M. Arkin of the Arms Race and Nuclear Weapons Research Project of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington disclosed the U.S. move to deploy the nuclear warheads in eight foreign countries. The report said the Philippines will get 32 nuclear depth bombs, 115 bombs, and 80 naval nuclear bombs. The others to receive nuclear bombs are Spain, Bermuda, Canada, Iceland, Puerto Rico, the Azores of Portugal and Diego Garcia.

Mercado urged the Batasan to take up the resolution as soon as it resumes session so it can show its resolve in protecting the country's sovereignty.

Opposition leader Teofisto Guingona Jr. said the reported deployment of the nuclear weapons here "makes the military bases primary targets for attack by an adversary not necessarily hostile to the Philippines." Guingona said the weapons "unduly endanger the safety of the Philippines not only from armed attack but also from accidental radiation leaks of deadly plutonium."

CSO: 5200/4306

GENERAL

NO NONPROLIFERATION UNTIL SUPERPOWERS WISH IT

Hong Kong HONGKONG STANDARD in English 1 Mar 85 p 9

[Editorial]

[Text]

THE irony is that as the war machines get more sophisticated man himself is not becoming any smarter. Between butter and steel, peace and its absence, many nations are all too prone to sacrifice the former for the latter so that for a moment of glory, the citizens are deprived, the treasury depleted and reason dodged.

As the United States launched the Manhattan Project over 40 years ago, the nuclear secret was a genie in an American lamp. Once the force was unleashed, it could not be bottled any longer as countries vied to possess the ultimate science. The gilded group of nuclear powers is still expanding; and as those in the clique beseech others to forsake the quest, the plea has come to sound like the caveats of the blessed about the aches of indulgence.

Pakistan, a poor nation, has quietly announced that its nuclear reactor can now enrich raw uranium, and is thus on the verge of producing the bomb. The caution and the treaty against nonproliferation, long lame, are flouted not only because the yearning for the knowledge is strong but mainly because the leading powers have mocked, in their craving for dominance, the wisdom of control.

Any argument against the atomic might, however cogent, is not persuasive when the United States and the Soviet Union are amassing at a menacing (and maddening) pace such lethal weapons. The cause of nuclear restraint cannot be promoted at a time when it is being defied by the "military-industrial complex" (the phrase of Dwight Eisenhower) which is now entwined with the Kremlin and Washington officials, elected or selected.

As the future unfurls, the real nuclear danger may pass from the glutted US and Soviet arsenals to the smaller — but no less harmful — caches of such rivals as Pakistan and India, Israel and Iraq. The arms race, with a logic that is also bizarre, has spiralled as the poor ape the rich with one country acquiring ever more destructive weapons only to be matched by its hostile neighbour, all along being coaxed by the patrons dangling tantalising baits.

Because the nuclear secret is over 40 years old and because of the leaps (happes?) in technology, the once forbidding knowledge of how the force works is almost textbook material in undergraduate university physics. Eight years ago an American student was able to extract information on the

making of a bomb from casual research, a minor feat which had Pakistani agents come courting the genius.

Now dozens of countries have nuclear reactors furnished through expensive contracts with developed nations which are too willing to woo and to sell the technology with government aid as the companies bid, all the while oblivious of the consequences. The sketch of the bomb is available to any individual with a rudimentary grounding in nuclear science and access to a modest library.

Since it is the enmity between the US and the Soviet Union that fuels the scores of conflicts among their proxies and since it is the major powers that are arming the combatants, it is only they who can arrest the headlong plunge into oblivion by the examples they set. The espousal of good intentions is just drone, a facile flow of words. To check the spread of nuclear arms, the effort at control need be as concerted as the marshalling of resources being consumed by those generals and arms dealers whose demands are unsurpassed except by those politicians making careers out of arousing jingoistic fever in the land.

The supreme powers, through the allegiances they command, to dampen the militarist fervour, must give moral strength to their routine hymns to freedom, peace, security, defence and detente. The parans to progress are echoes unless theirs is not just an offering of soothing words. There should be a dismantling of the fortifications of fear and fury, stone by stone, built over these 40 years of militarisation.

The poor countries can continue to plunder their own people to purchase arms because the rich societies have succeeded in peddling the idea that peace is kept only through the perpetual threat of doom; that might, posed or used, is in the end right. The other alternative is, of course, to have peace without a monstrous military with a momentum all its own.

To do so would be tantamount to a revolution in the East and the West, a spectre which is more stark than war to those whose business it is that hysteria and guns at the ready should go together like Tristan and Isolde or the genie and the lamp.

For those who pine for the chivalric cult, the plain — not to mention painful — truth is that when steel comes before bread, in the case of Pakistan acquiring the nuclear knowhow, the ideal is dead. There is no international nuclear nonproliferation until the US and the Soviet Union wish it is so, and begin by telling the weapons and widow makers, No!

CS0: 5250/0003

GENERAL

COMMENTARY VIEWS SOVIET 'FREEZE' PROPOSAL

OW031101 Beijing XINHUA in English 1042 GMT 3 Apr 85

["Commentary: Why Does Soviet Union Propose a 'Freeze'? by Tang Xiushan"--
XINHUA headline]

[Text] Moscow, April 2 (XINHUA) -- The Soviet Union is reported to have proposed to the United States at the Geneva talks a freeze of their nuclear missiles and a ban on space weapons development. In fact, the Soviet leadership and mass media have been talking about the proposal for some time now.

On March 22, Soviet party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev told the representatives of the Socialist International's Committee for Disarmament that the Soviet Union is firmly opposed to any move that might turn the talks into a sort of camouflage for an intensified arms race. For this reason, he said, his country proposes to freeze the nuclear arsenal of both sides and stop any fresh missile deployment -- the United States stops deployment of new missiles and the Soviet Union stops to strengthen its countermeasures. This will contribute greatly to the settlement of all the issues discussed in Geneva, he added.

Five days later, the party newspaper PRAVDA said in a commentary that although the Geneva talks were being held under "strict security", the principled stand of the Soviet Union at the talks is no secret at all. It said that the Soviet Union wishes to stop rather than continue the arms race, and therefore proposes a freeze on nuclear weapons and a halt to fresh missile deployment.

Then why has the Soviet Union put forward such a proposal while it is bargaining with the United States over space weapons and nuclear disarmament?

First, the new Soviet proposal has come at a time when the Geneva talks are confronted with enormous difficulties. ANIZVESTIYA commentary has noted that as the Geneva dialogue will be long and arduous, it might be advisable to start with some limited interim measures, for instance, a freeze on the production and deployment of nuclear missiles and their carriers. Such a move could make the principal issues at the talks easier to deal with.

Second, the Soviet Union appears to be worried by certain recent developments:

-- The U.S. Congress has approved the production of 21 more MX missiles which will cost 1.5 billion dollars;

-- The United States is determined to go ahead with the development of the space defence system, and furthermore, is inviting its European allies and other countries to participate in the system's research program;

-- NATO defence ministers have voiced their unanimous support for President Reagan's space defence initiative and have decided to continue the U.S. missile deployment in Europe;

-- Belgium has approved the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles on its territory after a long delay;

-- The United States and Canada have signed an agreement on the overhaul of the North American air warning system, which will enhance their joint air defence capabilities.

All these developments, in the Soviet view, point to the fact that the United States is seeking military supremacy through an intensified arms build-up which, if not "frozen", will aggravate the situation in Europe and make the Geneva talks more difficult.

The Soviet Union also believes that limited interim steps might be more acceptable as public opinion, particularly in the United States, favors a freeze. If the development and tests of nuclear and space weapons are frozen, then the Soviet Union will have realized its chief objective at the Geneva talks, that is, to prevent the United States from developing space weapons.

So far the United States has said nothing on the latest Soviet proposal. However, it is well-known that President Ronald Reagan has always been opposed to such a freeze which he believes will only serve the interests of the Soviet Union. Therefore, one may predict that there is little likelihood the Soviet "freeze" proposal will be accepted.

CSO: 5200/4013

GENERAL

COMMENTARY VIEWS U.S. PROPOSAL, DEBATE ON MX

OW301240 Beijing Domestic Service in Mandarin 1150 GMT 29 Mar 85

["International Current Events" commentary: "The United States Increases the Pace of Upgrading Nuclear Weapons"]

[Excerpts] Recently, the U.S. Congress had a dispute over the MX intercontinental missile issue. Under President Reagan's direct influence, the Senate and the House of Representatives preliminarily both passed by a small majority the Reagan administration's proposal to allocate \$1.5 billion this year to produce 21 MX intercontinental missiles. The United States has taken another step in the source of accelerating the updating of nuclear weapons.

A plan for developing MX missiles was first initiated when Carter was president. However, for various reasons the plan aroused extensive debate among the ruling and the public circles in the United States. These reasons included the plan's high cost and the fear that the Soviet Union might be irritated, thus prompting it to step up research and manufacturing of the fifth-generation missiles.

At first, Reagan had reservations about the plan. But since he took office, he has instituted a policy of the so-called restoration of U.S. national prestige and has quickened the pace of updating nuclear weapons. Hence, developing MX intercontinental missiles has become an important element in the Reagan administration's military expansion project.

After the proposal to allocate funds for producing MX missiles this year was submitted to the Congress, it still caused a lot of congressional debate. Quite a few congressmen, who objected to the plan, worried that approving the proposal would bring even greater difficulties to the government finances because the United States is suffering mounting deficits. The Reagan administration therefore made intensive efforts to win the congressmen's support. The administration emphasized that the development of MX missiles was not only necessary to increase U.S. nuclear power but also to ensure the U.S. bargaining position in the U.S.-Soviet negotiations in Geneva. Reagan especially called Kampelman, chief U.S. representative to the Geneva negotiations, back to Washington to persuade the Congress.

On 19 March, as the Senate was about to vote on the proposal, Reagan invited a number of wavering senators to lunch and told them that should the MX missile plan fail to materialize, the U.S. national defense would be seriously weakened. That very afternoon, just a few minutes after the Senate had voted on the proposal, Reagan issued a statement saying that the vote demonstrated the U.S. determination to the whole world and that MX missiles would enhance U.S. strength and its position in the Geneva negotiations.

The debate was even more heated in the House of Representatives. The proposal was finally passed by a small majority of six votes. Many congressmen believed that the vote for the plan was primarily aimed at supporting the U.S. position in the Geneva negotiations.

The dispute over the MX missile issue shows that the U.S. Government's nuclear strategy is to accelerate the updating of its nuclear weaponry system and develop new nuclear arms in order to hold nuclear disarmament talks with the Soviet Union on the basis of strengthened nuclear power.

CSO: 5200/4013

GENERAL

PRC DELEGATE ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, WORLD STRIFE

OW271206 Beijing XINHUA in English 1137 GMT 27 Mar 85

["Fu Hao Condemns South African Regime for Killing Blacks"--XINHUA headline]

[Excerpts] During the debate on disarmament and relaxation of international tension, Fu Hao, head of the Chinese delegation of the National People's Congress, noted that because the two superpowers possess more than 90 percent of the world's nuclear weaponry and are in a position to fight a nuclear war, they have a special and unshirkable responsibility to agree on disarmament. He welcomed the recent resumption of arms control talks by the United States and the Soviet Union and urged them to "enter into serious negotiations and do things genuinely helpful to world peace."

"China, as a nuclear state, has no intention to shirk its own responsibility in regard to nuclear disarmament. Provided the Soviet Union and the United States take the lead in reaching an agreement on the reduction of nuclear armaments, China is willing to join all the other nuclear states in international negotiations on nuclear arms reduction," he declared.

CSO: 5200/4011

GENERAL

U.S. ALLIES EXPRESS ANTINUCLEAR SENTIMENTS

OW120321 Beijing in English to East and South Africa 1700 GMT 10 Mar 85

[Text] The United States is just about to sit down to arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union at a time when some U.S. allies are expressing antinuclear sentiments. This is causing the United States some deep concern. Here is (Cheng Guang) with a look at the situation.

American nuclear strategy is having difficulty in the Pacific. New Zealand refused to allow nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed warships into its ports. Australia has decided it won't provide the U.S. with facilities to help it monitor tests of the MX missiles in the Pacific region. There are also signs of disagreement in Europe. Belgium and Holland have not yet agreed to have American cruise missiles deployed within their borders. A third NATO country, Greece, is proposing the Balkans should become a nuclear-free region and is demanding the Americans dismantle all nuclear weapons stationed there. Canada, another NATO member and a neighbor of the United States, still steadily refused to provide bases for American nuclear weapons.

The Washington-based Policy Research Institute recently disclosed an American nuclear deployment plan worked out in 1975. It describes how the United States might deploy nuclear weapons in Canada, Iceland, Spain, the British colony of Bermuda, Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, and Portuguese Azores. This disclosure has caused widespread grumbling by the governments and people in the countries concerned.

The United States is showing its concern over these sentiments. It is trying to deter the spread of these feelings by retaliating against New Zealand. The United States has replaced military exercises which were to include New Zealand with ones now involving only American and Australian forces. The Americans also threaten to stop sales of jet fighters to Greece and forbid Norway to sell any American-made jet fighters to Greece. All this is an attempt to prevent other countries from following the example of New Zealand and Greece. It is also an attempt to draw countries like Australia closer to the United States. The Americans don't view Australia's decision not to provide support for MX missile tests as vital. The Reagan administration has promised to keep its allies informed of any future emergency deployment plans for nuclear weapons and to seek their agreement. Meanwhile, the U.S. State and Defense Departments say they are preparing measures to counter any further spread of antinuclear sentiment among its allies.

CSO: 5200/4003

GENERAL

BRIEFS

HAYDEN ON TEST BAN VERIFICATION—The Australian government says a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons, if adopted, could be effectively verified. The foreign minister, Mr Hayden, said a 100 percent certification process was not possible given present technical capabilities. However, he outlined a number of proposed procedures which he said would go a long way towards achieving a generally acceptable level of verification. These included the establishment of an international network for recording seismic activity, the monitoring of atmospheric radiation or radiation leaks from underground tests, and on site inspections. The Australian proposal also calls for the setting up of international forums for handling technical complaints and ruling on suspected violations of a nuclear test ban. Mr Hayden was speaking in Federal Parliament in response to an opposition claim that advice to the government had suggested a comprehensive test ban would not be verifiable, and this would mean a setback for deterrence. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 21 Mar 85]

CSO: 5200/4308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ADELMAN SAID TO FUEL CAMPAIGN TO DISCREDIT USSR POLICY

PM020810 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 85 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Contrary to the Facts"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Mar -- THE WASHINGTON TIMES has published an interview with K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in which he mainly describes the Reagan administration's attitude to the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union.

Adelman tries to show that the Soviet Union has allegedly "broken" and continues to "break" its commitments under bilateral Soviet-U.S. and international treaties and agreements. Contrary to the facts, he stressed in making this statement that the United States sees its main task at the Geneva talks as making the Soviet Union "cease these violations" and subsequently elucidating the presence of possible spheres of mutual interest between the two countries. The director of the Disarmament Agency states with complete frankness that the Reagan administration sees the maintenance of the constant and ever increasing propaganda hoopla about the so-called "Soviet violations" as one of the main avenues of its activity to discredit the USSR's foreign policy, undermine its international prestige, and complicate the holding of the Geneva talks.

Within the framework of this campaign, on Adelman's admission, the White House has prepared and sent to Congress two secret reports on these "violations" and has subsequently published unclassified versions of them.

Administration spokesmen have held numerous press conferences for members and leaders of Congress, disposing them to all intents and purposes against agreement with the Soviet Union. The scale of the anti-Soviet measures that are being implemented can be judged by the fact that Adelman has spoken 20 times in Congress on the problem of so-called violations alone, not to mention his numerous public statements and interviews. Moreover, U.S. Administration spokesmen have held special talks with their NATO allies in an attempt to persuade them that the Soviet Union has "broken" its commitments.

The U.S. fiction about Soviet "violations" of their international commitments under agreements have been repeatedly exposed by the Soviet Union, yet nonetheless, administration spokesmen are continuing their slanderous campaign. Even Adelman was forced to admit in this interview that the reaction of certain U.S. NATO allies to the campaign of fiction launched by the administration has been quite different from what the White House expected. Some of the allies, in his words, "were more irritated by the essence of the campaign." All these facts show how the U.S. Administration is creating a certain kind of atmosphere around the Soviet-U.S. talks and distorting the real state of affairs.

CSO: 5200/1066

23 April 1985

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

WARSAW VIEWS RESUMPTION OF U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS

Preview of Shultz-Gromyko Talks

LD041217 Warsaw PAP in English 1117 GMT 4 Jan 85

[By PAP correspondent Edward Dylawski]

[Text] Geneva, Jan. 3 -- With only a few days to go before the Gromyko-Shultz talks, observers in Geneva are divided over the question whether the meeting would open a new round of disarmament negotiations between the two superpowers. Attention is drawn to the fact that the meeting of the two ministers has been set without any preconditions, which is a favourable sign in itself. As far as the American side is concerned, the Geneva meeting offers President Reagan a unique opportunity to prove that a disarmament accord has his absolute priority as now he claims.

Veteran newsmen covering the Geneva disarmament talks believe the Americans would run into a mistake if they assumed that the Soviet Union was going to accept the present American offers from 1982 and 1983 on intermediate range missiles and strategic nuclear weapons. The chances for agreement will not increase if the Americans hold on to the programme that has been rejected by the Soviet Union.

The observers, on the other hand, point to the communique issued on December 4, 1984, after the meeting of foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Berlin. They note that the communique carries no statement demanding from the United States to withdraw its missiles from Western Europe before further negotiations would take place.

Some observers even hope that under favourable circumstances, the Gromyko-Shultz meeting may be crowned with an announcement of the start of new disarmament negotiations in April.

Shultz-Gromyko First Round

LD082009 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1800 GMT 8 Jan 85

[Krzysztof Wojna report from Geneva]

[Text] The U.S.-Soviet talks should have ended at midday, but it was decided to meet once again in the afternoon. This additional round of talks, recognized as proof that the exchange of views is of an intensive and matter of fact character, is still not finished at 1800.

The talks have been surrounded by such a tight, secret atmosphere that even the slightest leaks have not occurred. It is not known whether one should count on the previously announced press conference of George Shultz or whether a short communique will only be announced. Not entering into speculation, one can only state — and this opinion dominates — that as a result of the talks further contacts are forecast; and after all, this is treated as a positive result. No one expected that this meeting, the first after a long break, would bring anything more. One should add that the forecast of further contacts, if the backstage speculations prove correct, does not at all mean that rapprochement of the positions of both sides was reached. The U.S. policy of accelerated armament and the concept of the militarization of space are still fundamentally contrary to the policy of the Soviet Union.

Joint Statement Noted

LD091428 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 2300 GMT 8 Jan 85

[Text] A joint Soviet-American statement after talks between Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko and American Secretary of State George Shultz was published in Geneva. The statement says that the two states will conduct disarmament negotiations. Their subject is to be a group of issues concerning space, nuclear, strategic, and medium-range weapons. The talks will aim at working out sufficient agreements to prevent the arms race in space, and halt it on earth. The date to start the talks and their location will be decided within a month through diplomatic channels.

Agreement 'Good Sign'

LD091456 Warsaw PAP in English 1423 GMT 9 Jan 85

[By PAP correspondent Edward Dylawski]

[Text] Geneva, Jan 9 -- After two days of total information blackout on the course of talks between Gromyko and Shultz, over 800 journalists from all over the world could finally send out a favourable report that agreement was reached. Thus world's expectations came true.

After a thirteen-month-long break in the disarmament dialogue between the Soviet Union and the U.S., it was announced that the dialogue would resume.

No one believed that the agreement would have such a range, i.e. that it would provide for the topic and goal of the disarmament negotiations between the two powers. It was rather expected that announcement would be made of the next meeting of both ministers and further discussions.

The achievement of the agreement between the Soviet Union and the U.S. during "negotiations on negotiations" has become a good sign for the year which has just started, irrespective of all obstacles which can still be met after the beginning of Soviet-American disarmament negotiations.

Press Views Talks

LD091512 Warsaw PAP in English 1400 GMT 9 Jan 85

[Text] Warsaw, Jan 9 -- The Polish press today carries reports and comments on the continuing Soviet-American dialogue following the two-day Gromyko-Shultz talks in Geneva. The Warsaw newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY wrote: "The joint Soviet-American statement has gone beyond expectations. It has confirmed the unquestionable success of the Geneva meeting, its key importance for the further shape of relations between the two superpowers which announced the resumption of new, all-round disarmament negotiations.

"Hence, the Soviet Union and the United States have reached an agreement on the scope and character of disarmament talks -- the most important in their to-date relations. They have put the superior interest of the need for debates over existing differences to contain the looming threat of arms escalation and deployment of weapons in outer space.

"They have met halfway the expectations of nations, have given them the hope for the opening of a new and better chapter of both the military superpower and East-West relations.

"Nobody can cherish the illusions that the resumed, interlinked negotiations will follow an easy course. To the contrary, one must expect laborious and long talks. But the gate to disarmament negotiations has now been opened in Geneva.

"The sense of responsibility for the fate of the world has won. The awareness that a lack of agreement on the question of checking the arms race at the stage when there is a real threat of extending them to the outer space would mean stepping through an irreversible threshold.

"Thus, following the period of confrontation policy, the Geneva meeting heralds the return to dialogue. Though it is going to be difficult, the beginning has already been made — and this is most important," said ZYCIE WARSZAWY.

The party daily TRYBUNA LUDU said in its report from Geneva: "The journalists who arrived in Geneva and waited for a news conference (after the Gromyko-Shultz meeting) shared the belief that the two-day talks in Geneva which lasted more than a dozen of hours enabled the two delegations led by the heads of the Soviet and U.S. diplomacies to exchange views and assessments of the strategic situation, present their stands and familiarize themselves better with them. This should foster further dialogue, and nobody in Geneva has any doubts it should be continued.

"The key obstacle is created by the fact that Washington is sticking to its anti-satellite defence programme, that is the so-called star wars concept. Differences on other issues also exist. Just for this reason it is necessary to hold further talks, further dialogue and, in the future, disarmament negotiations."

Reagan Press Conference

LD101034 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 0600 GMT 10 Jan 85

[Maksymilian Berezowski Washington report]

[Text] In his first press conference for 6 months, President Reagan began with a statement approving the results of talks held in Geneva between Gromyko and Shultz. He said that the U.S. goal in the approaching negotiations will be the reduction of nuclear armaments and consolidation of strategic stability. There are many essential divergencies which presage difficult negotiations, the President said, but he expressed hope that the new year will be a year of dialogue which will improve relations between the United States and the USSR.

In response to several questions, Reagan confirmed that despite inclusion of space armaments in negotiations, research work will continue in the United States. He refused to set limits for tests and preparations in this field. The President treated the idea of a summit meeting with reserve, saying that he would be ready to participate if really necessary and after a carefully prepared agenda, but in his opinion, a get-together meeting, as he put it, would be pointless. To the question on the appeal by Konstantin Chernenko for a return to detente, Reagan replied that the United States would welcome the chance on the condition that it would benefit from it, unlike the previous period when the West allegedly did not benefit from detente.

'Success' of Shultz-Gromyko Talks

LD101514 Warsaw PAP in English 1414 GMT 10 Jan 85

[Text] Warsaw, Jan 10 -- The Polish Army daily ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI pointed up the success of the Geneva meeting of the two foreign ministers -- George Shultz and Andrey Gromyko: "The meetings, its materialisation being an important and unquestionably optimistic political event, produced exceptionally valuable fruits." Simultaneously, the paper warned against making calculations for a quick success of the future Soviet-American disarmament talks: "One should expect the future talks to be hard, long-lasting and laborious. The success of the future negotiations will have to be enforced -- just like their opening had to be enforced.

"It will be also necessary to keep a vigilant eye on the hands of the generals in the Pentagon and Brussels and to maintain the necessary level of the Warsaw Treaty's defensive potential until the future negotiations bring solutions making it possible to reduce arms, including conventional weapons. But we are still a long way from this prospect."

The newspaper DZIENNIK LUDOWY said: "The joint statement issued after the unusually intensive talks confirms the decisive success of this meeting which carries key importance for the shape of relations between the two superpowers as well as for the general shape of the complicated situation which formed in the world.

"The optimism which has been widely raised by the Geneva meeting ensues from an important fact. Despite far-cast standpoints in the assessments of the situation, there was emerged the will of joint striving to seek beneficial solutions and liberate the world from the most dangerous armaments threatening with a total conflict which could bring an annihilation of the inhabitants of our planet."

Gromyko News Conference

LD141548 Warsaw PAP in English 1411 GMT 14 Jan 85

[Text] Warsaw, Jan 14 -- Writing about the Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko's TV debate with chief Soviet political commentators yesterday. The party daily TRYBUNA LUDU today pointed out Gromyko's statement that he had talked to State Secretary Shultz in Geneva on behalf of the USSR as well as its allies. TRYBUNA commented in a dispatch from Moscow.

"Poland, linked to the USSR with fraternal ties, has always actively backed the peace policy of that country, which has fully taken into account the Polish national and ideological strivings and aspirations."

Noting that the Geneva talks, understandably, did not exhaust all issues of topical interest for the world, TRYBUNA LUDU recalled that many Soviet peace initiatives put forth at various times remain valid, their goal being to curb armaments, also nuclear, consolidate peace, and restore the atmosphere of confidence and cooperation in international relations.

TRYBUNA underlined that all states, "not only great powers, but also medium-size and small states" should pool their efforts to turn these "proud goals" into reality.

In another dispatch from Moscow the Warsaw paper ZYCIE WARSZAWY wrote that Gromyko's debate on Soviet television "had shown convincingly that the USSR's position on such vital issues as peace, security, arms and disarmament contains no secrets nor ambiguities."

"The Soviet Union has reaffirmed its adherence to the principle of equal security as the prime rule of negotiating and the basis of all agreements."

The United Peasants Party daily DZIENNIK LUDOWY hailed Andrey Gromyko's statements as "an expose of Soviet foreign policy on key issues of world peace and disarmament, an ardent wish and honest readiness to the furthest-going agreements with the great power across the Atlantic."

Gromyko Comments, U.S. Response

LD151218 Warsaw PAP in English 1119 GMT 15 Jan 85

[By PAP commentator]

[Text] Warsaw, Jan 14 -- It was with utmost interest and great hope that the Polish public opinion received the exhaustive statements made by the Soviet foreign minister, one of the most outstanding experts and co-architects of international relations in the second half of the 20th century, Andrey Gromyko, who outlined the prospects for the Soviet-American negotiations on key issues facing humanity: effective arrest of the arms race and elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

Polish television interrupted its regular programmes for nearly two hours last Sunday, January 13, to re-lay from the Soviet television the broadcast which was simultaneously telecast worldwide. Leading Polish newspapers on Monday frontpaged the full text of Andrey Gromyko's conversation with four prominent Soviet political commentators. The statements made by the Soviet statesman were the more important that they were published after a CPSU Political Bureau session on the Geneva meeting with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. Andrey Gromyko is one of the longest-serving members of this bureau.

The head of the Soviet diplomacy made a positive appraisal of the Geneva meeting. In this context he underscored inseparability of the disarmament issues, both in the sphere of strategic armaments and inter-mediate nuclear arms, and prevention of outer space militarisation.

Andrey Gromyko, who had been Soviet delegate to the first conferences of the anti-fascist coalition which set the ground for the United Nations Organisation at the end of World War Two and who later took part in forwarding all the key Soviet peace initiatives, demonstrated the highest competence in dispelling a number of myths. One of them was the thesis disseminated by the Western propaganda that the Soviet Union was not allegedly paying appropriate attention to the problem of arms control.

For us, the Polish people, of special importance is the statement that the Soviet Union approaches the Western countries and the U.S. on its own behalf as well as on behalf of its allies and that this reinforces the common policy of peace pursued by the fraternal socialist countries.

These questions are systematically discussed during sessions of the Political Consultative Committee and other Warsaw Treaty organs. The political line fixed during those meetings also takes into account our national and ideological strivings and aspirations as well as guaranteeing our security.

The prospects for the negotiations which are most important for humanity depend on the stand taken by the American side. The first reactions to Andrey Gromyko's statements testify to differences inside the U.S. Administration. The differences showed between George Shultz and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. The latter said on Sunday he did not know anything about any agreement reached in Geneva that would link the negotiations to three spheres of disarmament. As a model representative of the military-industrial complex, he stressed once more that the U.S. was not considering the idea of dropping its research into space weapons.

Despite all this, we hope that common sense will emerge victorious over the interests of the group of arms producers, in line with the will of humanity.

Need for Compromise

LD121257 Warsaw PAP in English 1110 GMT 12 Mar 85

["Wishes for Partners in Geneva Talks"—PAP headline; by PAP journalist Andrezej Rayzacher]

[Text] Warsaw, March 11 -- Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and outer space armaments, awaited long and with hope by the entire world, are to start. On the eve of their inauguration the two sides stressed that the negotiations would be complex and difficult. Thus [word indistinct] are no grounds for excessive optimism.

At this moment, no one is able to foresee what shape a compromise may take, since given the well-known differences in the attitude of the Soviet Union and the U.S. it is only a compromise which may ensure an effect of the negotiations. And the two sides declare their good will.

The Soviet Union declared that it was ready to "go its part of the road" leading to agreement and expects the U.S. would do the same thing, being aware of the weight of responsibility for peace which lies on the great powers.

Poland is fully aware of the significance of the moment when the negotiators of the two great powers face one another in Geneva. The interest displayed by the Polish people in a successful outcome of their work is obvious. If there is no such outcome, the world will become an even more dangerous place and our situation in this world will become even more difficult.

CSO: 5200/12

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

CZECHOSLOVAKIA VIEWS GENEVA TALKS HOPEFULLY

Christian Peace Group Cited

AU121853 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 9 Mar 85 p 2

[Text] Prague (CTK) -- In spite of all the disappointments to date, the planned talks between the Soviet Union and the United States which are to begin on 12 March in Geneva are evoking new hopes in all people who have the future of our planet at heart, the declaration issued on this occasion by the leadership of the Christian Peace Conference states. Peace-loving people throughout the world, regardless of their political or religious convictions, are today demanding an end to the arms race, which is being transferred also into outer space, and are hoping that these talks will provide an impulse for concrete steps leading to detente and to guaranteed security for everyone.

Success Could Revive Detente

LD121542 Prague CTK in English 1043 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Text] Prague March 12 (CTK) -- Successful results of the new Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear weapons beginning in Geneva today could bring about not only a basic turn on the road of disarmament but also in the further development of East-West relations, Czechoslovak Radio commented today.

Its special correspondent in Geneva noted that the Soviet refusal to put off the talks because of official mourning is generally highly appreciated in the Swiss capital. The immediate election of a new general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party at the same time prevented the opponents of understanding from casting doubts by various malevolent speculations on the continuity of the Soviet stand in question which are on the agenda of talks, the correspondent said.

In view of the aspects of the talks, the greater concern is thus [word indistinct] by the position of the United States, particularly its negative attitude beforehand to measures aimed at averting military use of space.

The Slovak paper PRAVDA called it extremely important that both sides expressed the view that the talks, just as all efforts to limit and reduce armament, "should eventually result in a complete and general liquidation of nuclear weapons."

The Geneva talks will be very complex and exacting, ZEMEDLSKE NOVINY wrote. Their failure would further worsen the situation in the world, especially by bringing in new dangerous elements of unpredictability and uncertainty. Mankind can no longer afford to balance over a nuclear abyss, the farmers' daily stressed.

Opening of Talks Reported

LD121648 Prague CTK in English 1318 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, 12 Mar (CTK)--Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms opened here today. They follow agreement on the subject and aims of the talks reached during a Soviet-U.S. meeting in January 1985, which provides for the evaluation and solution of a complex of issues concerning nuclear and space weapons in their interrelation.

CSO: 5200/3004

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAGUE EMPHASIZES PURPOSE, PROPER FORMAT OF TALKS

LD120020 Prague CTK in English 1658 GMT 11 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, 11 Mar (CTK correspondent)--The new talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear and space weapons which are due to open here tomorrow will be extremely important for mankind.

The principles agreed upon in January by the foreign ministers of the two countries, Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz, provide for an entirely new form and dimensions of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The talks will centre not only on existing strategic nuclear weapons and intermediate-range missiles but also on anti-satellite and anti-missile systems.

The purpose of the talks is to reach effective agreements aimed at averting an arms race in space and at halting it on earth, at limiting and reducing the number of nuclear weapons, and at strengthening strategic equilibrium.

It was agreed that progress in one sphere must be accompanied also by progress in the other two fields of negotiations but the statements emanating from the United States show its peculiar interpretation of the principle of mutual interdependence of the three "baskets," and its evident reluctance to abandon its so-called strategic defence initiative.

The U.S. administration is using doubtful arguments to justify its stance, trying to convince its NATO allies that it has a [words indistinct] space weapons of which full use should be made, and at the same time to make Congress and the U.S. public believe that star wars preparations have already been started by the USSR and that the United States must catch up with it.

The star wars concept, outlined by Ronald Reagan in March 1983, is being presented to the public as a defensive and peace-loving initiative but is in fact a plan to transform the United States into an impregnable fortress as part of the attempt to gain military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The Soviet stand is entirely clear: The USSR is opposed to the deployment of any weapons in space, and seeks a complete ban of the use of force in space and from space towards the earth, just as from the earth towards objects in space.

CSO: 5200/3004

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GUANGMING RIBAO ASSESSES GENEVA ARMS CONTROL TALKS

HK260328 Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 10 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by Wang Ling [3769 3781] and De Xin [1795 9515]: "An Arduous Course-- On the New U.S.-Soviet Arms Control Talks"]

[Text] On 12 March, the United States and the Soviet Union will start a new package of arms control talks in Geneva to discuss issues concerning their space weapons, strategic nuclear weapons, and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. This will be an important meeting between the two superpowers in the course of turning the deadlock into dialogue since the suspension of their nuclear arms talks in late 1983, and will attract the attention of the world community. Both superpowers have their respective purposes and will place stress on different issues when they enter into the talks. Since the beginning of this year they have stepped up their respective diplomatic activities and have carried out an intense propaganda war on the issues involved in the talks. This has shown that the following major differences remain between them:

First, the issue of space weapons. This is the focus of their dispute. The United States is now taking the lead in the research and development of space weapons on the basis of its mighty economic strength, and the "strategic defense initiative" (or the "star wars plan") is now the trump card in the hands of Washington. If their plans are successful, the United States will dominate outer space and pose major strategic threats to the Soviet Union. In the matter of developing space weapons, the Soviet Union cannot compare with the United States in economic strength and technological development. So Moscow's main objective is to try by all possible means to hold back the development of space weapons by the United States. Chernenko once pointed out that the talks should "first conclude an agreement on demilitarizing outer space." However the United States sharply indicated that it would never give up its research work for the "strategic defense initiative." The Reagan administration has asked for increasing the appropriations for the "star wars plan" in 1986 to twice as much as this year, and the United States will continue to test antisatellite missiles this winter and next spring.

Second, the relationship between the talks on space weapons and the talks on strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union stressed that the talks on these three issues must be linked together and that the talks on the other two types of weapons cannot be separated with the issue of

space weapons in an attempt to conclude an agreement on a single type of weapon. However, the United States is opposed to the Soviet position of taking arrangements for controlling space weapons as a prerequisite for the talks on the other two types of weapons; instead, it proposes that two sets of talks respectively on offensive weapons and defensive weapons should be held at the same time with stress being placed on offensive weapons and emphasizes that separate agreements can be reached in each set of the talks.

Third, the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe and MX missiles on the territory of the United States. The Soviet Union has demanded that the deployment of these two types of missiles be stopped and warns that if the United States continues to deploy intermediate-range missiles in Europe, it will "impair the foundation for the talks." However, the United States has flatly turned down the Soviet demands and is going ahead with the deployment plan.

On the eve of the talks, both the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to take the initiative in their hands and to win support from public opinion, so they have adopted their respective measures and countermeasures. The Soviet Union has concentrated on denouncing the U.S. "star wars plan" as an offensive and aggressive plan, warning that if the United States does not stop its tests of space weapons, the Soviet Union will "continue to develop and perfect its nuclear weapons rather than reducing its nuclear arsenal." At the same time, the Soviets have also proposed the suspension of space weapons development, intermediate-range missile deployment in Europe, and modernization of the existing strategic nuclear weapons during the talks in an attempt to hold back the United States and to drive a wedge between the United States and its European allies. In order to cope with the Soviet Union's diplomatic and propaganda offensive, the United States has paid special attention to coordinating its position with its European allies and has decided that the talks with the Soviet Union should be carried out on the basis of "strength" and "unity" of the Western alliance. President Reagan said that "the unity and solidarity of the alliance are the key for achieving successes in the new round of U.S.-Soviet arms control talks." He also sent letters to leaders of the major West European countries to explain the U.S. position. Leaders of such major European countries as Britain, Italy, and the FRG also visited Washington one after another. They reiterated that the purpose of the United States and Western Europe is not to win superiority but to "seek an equilibrium of strength" against the background of the Soviet arms expansion. The governments of the FRG, Britain, France, and Italy have separately expressed their support for the research work on the "star wars plan." During the talks, NATO will continue its planned deployment of intermediate-range missiles. In order to remove Western Europe's misgivings, the United States sent Secretary of Defense Weinberger to attend the 22nd international "defense knowledge" conference in Munich in early February. On that occasion, Weinberger conducted "unity diplomacy" and did a great deal of work to explain the U.S. position, reiterating that the United States "will not disregard the security of its allies."

All previous U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks have been arduous. This time, since the talks will have to deal with arms control in three fields at the same time, the talks will be even more complicated. At present, although both sides have

made some reconciliatory postures by expressing their willingness to "talk seriously" and to "make compromises," various signs show that they are still trying to maintain their own advantages by containing and weakening the other side through the talks. That is to say, neither of them has fundamentally changed their position of contending for military superiority.

We welcome the resumption of the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks. However, the talks should not be used as a means for concealing their arms race. Instead, the talks should lead to effective agreement on arms reduction and lead to an end of the dangerous arms race. The people throughout the world will wait and see whether the two superpowers will be able to do this.

CSO: 5200/4008

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CHINA DAILY ON U.S. 'PATIENCE, STRENGTH, UNITY' AT GENEVA

HK130403 Beijing CHINA DAILY in English 13 Mar 85 p 4

[By Chen Si]

[Text] Washington--"Patience, strength and unity" are U.S. President Ronald Reagan's instructions on last Friday to his arms negotiators for the resumed Geneva talks with the Soviet Union. To some extent, this can be regarded as an outline of Washington's position to be taken in the forthcoming talks.

Upon sending his arms negotiators off to Geneva, Reagan said the Americans know "that our differences with the Soviet Union are great. Patience, strength and unity--Western unity--will be required if we are to have a successful outcome."

Washington often says that the only language Moscow could understand is "strength." But, in fact, both of the two superpowers are worshipers of "strength." U.S. officials have repeatedly said that it is the U.S. further rebuildup of military strength that has forced Moscow to return to the negotiation table. They claimed that during the period of negotiations, U.S. military modernization programme should not be abandoned. To maintain its military strength, Washington, despite its huge deficit of about \$200 billion, has to further cut social welfare spending and to increase military spending.

Before the start of the Geneva talks, the Reagan administration launched a campaign to prevent the congress from cutting the military budget. The president invited congressmen from both houses to the White House in a bid to gain their support. At the same time, he sent his cabinet officials to the congress to explain the administration's disarmament policy. It is reported that Reagan's efforts have produced some result.

However, "strength" is not the sole weapon of Washington for a successful outcome of the Geneva talks. As Western Europe is uneasy about the superpowers' military buildup and the militarization of space, and Moscow is making use of such uneasiness to undermine U.S. relations with its European allies, Reagan has to attach importance to Western unity.

To fulfill their own schemes, the two superpowers have been engaged in a war of diplomacy in the last few months. President Reagan invited Federal German,

British and Italian leaders to the White House for talks, to obtain the allies' support for his negotiation policy and the "star wars" system, and press them to implement the NATO's plan for the deployment of U.S. missiles in Western Europe. It seems that the U.S. scheme has partially succeeded.

Meanwhile, Moscow also launched its diplomatic offensive in Western Europe. During his visit to Italy and Spain, and his talks with foreign ministers of West European countries in Moscow, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko tried hard to persuade U.S. allies to abandon the missile deployment plan and reject the U.S. "star wars" programme. The Soviet Union warned that West European countries must bear the responsibilities for the deterioration of the international situation unless they accept the Soviet advice. But Moscow's campaign seemed to have got nowhere.

Reagan has acknowledged that the talks will be "long and difficult" because of the complexity of issues at stake and the sharp differences dividing the superpowers. That's why he thought that "patience" is necessary in the talks. Max Kampelman, U.S. chief negotiator, said, "We must be prepared to stay at the negotiation table one day longer than the Soviets." The statement shows that Washington will not make concessions easily in the talks and is prepared to fight a drawn-out battle with Moscow in Geneva while holding the banner of "negotiations."

But, no matter what the two superpowers have claimed, people all over the world hope that both Washington and Moscow show sincerity in arms control. However, there are signs that the two superpowers, while holding talks in Geneva, are trying to step up their paces of the nuclear arms race and the arms race in the outer space.

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

REAGAN ACCUSES USSR OF TREATY VIOLATIONS

OW190821 Beijing XINHUA in English 0813 GMT 19 Mar 85

["Reagan Lashes Out at Soviets During Visit to Canada"—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Quebec City, 18 Mar (XINHUA)--Visiting U.S. President Ronald Reagan, while saying that he was ready to work with the Kremlin for "more constructive relations," today accused the Soviet Union of treaty violations.

Reagan, who is here for talks with Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, said the Soviets had violated the Yalta Agreement, the Geneva Chemical Weapons Convention, Salt-2, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Helsinki Human-Rights Accord.

President Reagan has had two rounds of talks with Mulroney, he added that Vice President George Bush and Secretary of State George Shultz had a "very good talk" with the new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev while they were in Moscow last week for the late President Konstantin Chernenko's funeral.

"We all want to hope that last week's change of leadership in Moscow will open up new possibilities (for a more constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union)," said Reagan.

But he also pointed out that "we must remember that the Soviet record of compliance with past agreements has been poor."

When asked why the president had turned sharply from his recent conciliatory tone to the Soviet Union, Reagan's aides said that the president was only being "realistic."

Although Reagan is ready to hold talks with Gorbachev, they added, this does not mean restraining criticisms of Soviet behavior.

A U.S. official who refused to be identified told reporters that the president "felt if Mr Gorbachev is ready, they could have a real, substantive meeting at this point."

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA CRITICIZES U.S. AS 'UNHELPFUL' AT TALKS

OW171916 Beijing XINHUA in English 1908 GMT 17 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 17 Mar (XINHUA)--PRAVDA in a commentary today criticized recent talks by U.S. officials as unhelpful to the creation of good atmosphere in the arms control talks in Geneva.

The commentary denounced U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz's statement that the U.S. will not give up its "star wars" plan in the negotiations and will maintain a long-term confrontation with the Soviet Union on this issue. The commentary said he was defending space militarization.

The commentary said it was contrary to the goals of the Geneva negotiations to continue to test and produce space weapons. It reiterated that the Soviet Union will never sacrifice the interests of itself and its allies.

Director of the Soviet News Agency TASS Sergey Losev said in a commentary carried in the paper RURAL LIFE that Washington's recent actions including the allocation of funds for missile production were not in conformity with its expressed readiness to work for obvious results in the Geneva talks. He stressed that the White House's stubbornness in pursuing its "star wars" plan would create insurmountable obstacles in the way of an agreement.

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR ARMS NEGOTIATOR ON U.S. STANCE AT TALKS

OW170334 Beijing XINHUA in English 0256 GMT 17 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 16 Mar (XINHUA)--Soviet Chief Negotiator Viktor Karpov criticized the United States today for trying to evade the issue of militarization of space at the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks, which opened on 12 March.

Some statements by officials in Washington in connection with the talks gave the impression that they wanted "to revise the understanding on the subject, tasks and objectives of the talks, which was reached in the meeting on 7 and 8 January between (Soviet Foreign Minister) Andrey Gromyko and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz," Karpov said in an interview at the evening news program of the Soviet television.

"There is an impression," Karpov continued, "that the America side would like to discuss at the talks not the question of ensuring peaceful outer space, of prohibiting deployment of strike space weapons, but to lecture on the alleged benefits of the American 'star wars' concept, which is in essence directed at making outer space a source of military threat to mankind."

Karpov stressed that the January agreement should be the basis for serious talks.

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CEAUSESCU HOPES FOR SUCCESS OF GENEVA TALKS

OW150841 Beijing XINHUA in English 0719 GMT 15 Mar 85

[Text] Bucharest, 14 Mar (XINHUA)--Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu said today the Romanian people and the people of other countries wished the Soviet-U.S. Geneva talks would yield positive results. He also expressed the hope that all nuclear weapons would be eliminated from the earth and space.

Ceausescu was speaking after receiving a "November 17" gold medal from a delegation of the International Union of Students whom he received.

He said that the international situation was deteriorating drastically at the time of the 40th anniversary of the anti-fascist victory. In order to halt the arms race and prevent the world from slipping into the abyss of war, the world's people including the youth and college students should resolutely step up their struggle and strengthen their unity and cooperation.

He said the Geneva talks had just begun and could not solve the extremely grave problems, but he hoped the talks would produce positive results.

He highly praised the role of the Romanian youth and the youth of other countries in social and economic development and in the struggle for independence and peace the "November 17" gold medal is the highest honor awarded by the International Union of Students. The words "November 17, 1939" are inscribed on it in memory of the anti-fascist demonstration by students in Prague.

The delegation of the International Union of Students has arrived for a visit at the invitation of the Union of Communist Students' Association of Romania.

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NATO OFFICIAL CITED ON U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS

OW110945 Beijing XINHUA in English 0904 GMT 11 Mar 85

[Text] Madrid, 10 Mar (XINHUA)--Lord Carrington, secretary general of NATO, in an interview with EL PAIS in Brussels, said that the U.S.-USSR nuclear talks in Geneva will be long and difficult, but given a serious approach on the part of the Soviet Union, the talks may be fruitful.

Lord Carrington stressed the need for an understanding between West Europe and the United States. "Europe will be unable to maintain its defenses without the United States," he said.

Asked what he was most concerned about regarding NATO, Carrington replied: "First, we are in danger of being weak in conventional weapons, and second, troubles may crop up between the United States and Europe."

He warned that if the arms race is not curbed, detente will be out of the question.

CSO: 5200/4003

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SEVERAL UN ENVOYS URGE SUPERPOWER ARMS CURBS

OW160723 Beijing XINHUA in English 0639 GMT 16 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, 15 Mar (XINHUA)--Permanent representatives to the UN from Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, India, Greece and Sweden today called on Moscow and Washington to stop their arms race and negotiate "seriously and positively" on nuclear disarmament.

At a press conference here, the six representatives asked the U.S. and Soviet delegations to the Geneva talks to do all that is possible to gain rapid and positive results.

In the appeal, which was handed to Max Kampelman and Viktor Karpov, respective leaders of the U.S. and Soviet delegations at Geneva, the six ambassadors said the negotiations are an "important and well-received" event which will be beneficial to "all human beings and all nations."

The six nations are also sponsors of the "Delhi Declaration" issued 28 January, which asks the U.S. and the Soviet Union to set an example on nuclear disarmament.

CSO: 5200/4003

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH MILITARY STRATEGIST SUPPORTS SDI RESEARCH

PM291420 Paris LE FIGARO MAGAZINE in French 23-29 Mar 85 pp 104-107

[Interview with Colonel Marc Geneste, vice chairman of the Total Strategy Studies Circle, by Albert Palle--date, place not given]

[Text] [LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] The government has expressed condescending skepticism about President Reagan's so-called "star wars" plan. Why?

[Col Geneste] Because it casts doubt on existing strategic concepts, the concepts of a degree of "deterrence" by nuclear terror. But technology has no pity on strategic theories. It is technological "progress" which is behind the Reagan plan. It is this progress which leads to this strategic revolution, which has considerable geopolitical, industrial, and even moral implications. It is a whim of the fifth republic always to want to dissociate itself from the Americans. It would be serious if that were to lead us to dissociate ourselves from the physicists.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] What does "star wars" mean?

[Col Geneste] It is an eye-catching term dreamed up by American journalists and bears no real relation to the Reagan plan, which is called the Strategic Defense Initiative or SDI. Soviet propaganda immediately accused Reagan of trying to "militarize space" whereas the aim is, instead, to "neutralize space" by establishing the means to destroy offensive weapons there. It is now that space is militarized.

Since 1972 the SALT I treaty has guaranteed the free passage of ICBM's to their targets. The aim of the Reagan plan is to strip these projectiles, which are mankind's nightmare, of their outrageous and intolerable privilege.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] What worries the Soviets so much?

[Col Geneste] It is that the Reagan initiative heralds the return to the superiority of defensive weapons over offensive weapons and the end of a strange system of security based on freely accepted vulnerability, on a mutual suicide pact: the country which took the initiative in launching a nuclear strike could destroy its enemy but would expose itself to a response which would destroy it. This is what is known as the MAD strategy. Unfortunately, only the Americans took this pact seriously. At the same time as they limited the production of their intercontinental missiles, they sacrificed on the altar of this philosophy not only their ABM defenses but also their air defenses and disregarded passive defenses. Throughout that time the Soviets were increasing their offensive capability -- the experts think they can now fire three or four nuclear salvos to one America salvo. In addition, while pretending to respect the SALT treaty, they

maintained the ABM means they had in 1972, strengthened their air defenses, and increased the number of shelters. American experts think that in 12 years the Soviets have spent more on strategic defense than on offensive weapons, in which they now have overwhelming superiority. Thus they are at present much less vulnerable than the Western countries. The famous "balance of terror" which would be broken by the Reagan plan has already largely been tipped in their favor. It is easy to understand why they will make every effort to prevent the Americans from becoming less vulnerable.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] But has not the strategy of "deterrence by terror" protected us so far? Why change it?

[Col Geneste] What has protected us is primarily the fact that the Soviets, by their own admission, have probably never wanted to wage nuclear war. But the deterrent provided by MAD and the American terror of escalation have enabled them to play with impunity on the strategic chessboard, without risking anything but verbal reprobation. All strategies work...in peacetime. The "deterrent" of the Maginot Line worked well...until World War II. People confuse cause and effect. Deterrence is an effect. The cause is good defense. The MAD strategy no longer answers the question: What do we do if deterrence fails?

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] Is there really another solution?

[Col Geneste] Yes, modern technology enables us to get a glimpse of it. Initially, it is to increase terror by defense. Subsequently, it is to replace terror by defense. How? By neutralizing the two tools of the offensive: ground forces and missiles. Against the former, in addition to the new conventional gadgets, there is the neutron bomb. It is the unanswerable defense weapon.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] And against missiles?

[Col Geneste] Against the other tool of the offensive there is precisely the promises of the Reagan initiative. After the land-based tactical shield, the space shield still has to be deployed.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] It is precisely the efficacy of this space shield which the critics of the Reagan plan, especially our ministers, dispute.

[Col Geneste] These negative forecasts are unconfirmed. In 1932 Einstein thought mastery of nuclear energy was impossible. In 1944 Oppenheimer obtained the atom bomb. The same Oppenheimer thought a hydrogen bomb impracticable. Edward Teller produced one in 3 years. Today Teller and his Livermore laboratory team maintain that the lasers and other "beams" weapons will get the better of the missiles. I have known them for a long time and I am more inclined to believe them than our ministers, with whose sources of information I am not acquainted.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] Charles Hernu and several others repeatedly state that there will be no space shield before 2010.

[Col Geneste] Nobody knows. But this is not Edward Teller's view. We have all seen on television how it was possible to manually capture a stray satellite from the American space shuttle. A nuclear missile does not go as fast as a satellite. This is not science fiction: It might perhaps be possible to shoot it with a gun during its 20-minute space trajectory. The American "high frontier" school maintains that a network of hunter satellites in permanent orbit could police space in this way as from tomorrow. According to Max Kampelman, one of the U.S. negotiators in Geneva, elements of this shield could be deployed as early as 1990 and would be 90-percent effective.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] So why are people talking about the year 2010?

[Col Geneste] They are thinking about a rival school to "high frontier" which envisages a different system for a more distant date. This system would use what the Americans call beam weapons. This is Teller's school. According to him "high frontier's" hunter satellites would eventually be as vulnerable as their targets to the beam weapons he is developing at Livermore. In addition, the presence of these hunters would aggravate the "militarization of space," which is a tool of Soviet propaganda. Teller's idea -- which I personally approve -- aims instead to establish a new type of air defense capable of cleaning the sky of all the offensive weapons which might travel through it, from the ground or the sea. Only observation and warning devices would remain in space. According to Teller, the Soviets already have a lead over the Americans in this sphere.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] Does this mean the end of the old deterrence?

[Col Geneste] No, not yet. At present we have the MAD strategy. It is only gradually that a mutual assured survival strategy will replace mutual assured destruction. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has spoken of a "transitional period." Until the space shield becomes effective, the threat of MAD-type reprisals will remain. That is why the Americans are going to deploy their MX missiles. But in the very near future some limited targets of Soviet Missiles (missile silos, ships, and so forth) could be defended by very simple systems. The speed of the nuclear warheads reentering the atmosphere is such that if they meet the slightest object on their trajectory, they are literally impaled on it. For instance, a hail of bullets would be fired point-blank at them at a range of 2,000 or 3,000 meters and would destroy them.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] Why do you prefer the beam weapons?

[Col Geneste] Because they are the future. If beam weapons are produced, defense projectiles will travel 40,000 times faster than their targets, the attack weapons. They will intercept at the speed of light nuclear warheads moving at 5-7 km per second. However numerous they are, the latter will not be able to saturate defense, any more than tanks (however many there are) can pass through a barrage of neutrons.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] When protected by their ABM shield will the Americans not be tempted one day to abandon Europe to the threats of the SS-20 missiles and to its creeping neutralism?

[Col Geneste] It is the reverse which is true. There is reason to fear that the Americans, who have become more vulnerable and haunted by the prospect of nuclear escalation, might hesitate to commit suicide to defend Europe. This anxiety lay behind our strike force. But the more their risks diminish, the more inclined they will be to honor their commitments. I would like to add that, according to the American experts, the SS-20 missiles are easier targets than the ICBM's.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] In these conditions is the current French opposition to the Reagan initiative reasonable?

[Col Geneste] I do not think so. But the official statements, which have been rather negative so far, are at the same time ambiguous enough to safeguard the future. The important thing is that our politicians should not hinder the work of technicians in this sphere. The Japanese and Germans have already agreed to collaborate on the Reagan plan, whose technical repercussions will certainly be considerable. Our scientists and technicians must not lag behind. Moreover, they are well aware of what is at stake.

[LE FIGARO MAGAZINE] Will the arms race be revived?

[Col Geneste] Perhaps. But since Hiroshima mankind has not found any more intelligent way of safeguarding peace than the accumulation of the means of wiping out civilization. There is a better way. If the space defense plans succeed, which I do not doubt, we will eventually have disarmament imposed by arms. The monstrous weapons of extermination will then be only good for scrap tomorrow or the day after. We are entering a technical phase which will give decisive superiority to defense -- for a time. This is the West's historic opportunity, the promise of its survival at the same time as its moral victory.

CSO: 5200/2558

SPACE ARMS

MITTERRAND MEETS WITH GORBACHEV 13 MAR

Foresees No Change in Policy

LD140041 Paris Domestic Service in French 2300 GMT 13 Mar 85

[Excerpt] Francois Mitterrand was received by Gorbachev for 45 minutes. Mikhail Gorbachev has, moreover, accepted an invitation to pay an official visit to France. At the end of the meeting Francois Mitterrand spoke of Mikhail Gorbachev's personality: He is a calm and astute man with a good head on his shoulders. He is fairly direct in language as well as in approach to problems, but Francois Mitterrand also indicated he expected no profound changes in Soviet policy, the arrival in power of a new man being insufficient to change the direction of such a country.

Gorbachev 'Calm, Sharp, Subtle'

HK140150 Hong Kong AFP in English 0129 GMT 14 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow, 14 Mar (AFP)--French President Francois Mitterrand described new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev last night as a "calm, sharp, subtle" man who approaches problems "straightforwardly" and speaks in a "direct, precise, interesting tone." However, noted Mr Mitterrand, yesterday's "relatively brief" meeting was not enough to judge Mr Gorbachev's personality, much less his intentions.

Mr Mitterrand made his statements after a 45-minute meeting with Mr Gorbachev, following the funeral of former Soviet President Konstantin Chernenko, who died Sunday. Mr Mitterrand said his talks with Mr Gorbachev had included the disarmament issues, including the controversial U.S. space-based anti-nuclear missile program, commonly known as "star wars." He said he thought Mr Gorbachev was ready to conduct an "audacious" foreign policy, particularly by favoring detente, but stressed that Soviet policy depended only partially on personalities. Mr Mitterrand left immediately for Paris, where he arrived late Wednesday night.

The Soviet news agency TASS said Mr Gorbachev had accepted Mr Mitterrand's invitation to visit France, but without setting a date. Mr Mitterrand visited the Soviet Union in July 1984.

CSO: 5200/2517

SPACE ARMS

LE MONDE VIEWS U.S.-USSR ARMS TALKS IN GENEVA

PM111313 Paris LE MONDE in French 10-11 Mar 85 pp 1, 4

[Commentary by Michel Tatu: "The Geneva Meeting"]

[Excerpt] What could happen at the Geneva meeting? An old principle which has applied in similar circumstances is that the initial positions are displayed in a rather inflexible and determined way on the communist side and in a more conciliatory tone on the Western side.

As the resistance of one side grows stronger over the weeks, the ultimate concessions made by the other become more important. This time the American positions have little chance of evolving very quickly since Mr Nitze has already painted his president's "hard" line in the most positive possible light. The Soviet positions, on the other hand, ought to change, always assuming sufficiently coherent leadership can make the necessary choices in Moscow.

For instance, it is obvious that the Kremlin will have to pay a price to secure American concessions on the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] and that the price will be even higher if these concessions are to be made in the current phase of research. Although Moscow is not admitting it, Mr Reagan's program has already had the effect of bringing the Soviets back to the negotiating table and it will continue to be a subject of negotiation even if Washington claims it will not. Moreover, an American official, speaking to journalists off the record, admitted that it would make "a hell of a difference" [to the continuation of the SDI] if the USSR made a major reduction in its offensive weapons.

It is already difficult to see how Moscow can maintain its stock of 308 SS-18 super missiles--much more powerful missiles than the American MX missile, which is now in production--without the United States using them as another segment either for its SDI or for equivalent new offensive weapons.

Fewer European Objections

What about Europe in all this? The greater flexibility of the American ideas has helped restore a kind of consensus in the Atlantic alliance. After Mrs Thatcher's visit to Washington, Mr Kohl and Mr Craxi in turn gave their support to the U.S. administration's current plans, the West German chancellor emphasizing more especially his desire to benefit from their repercussions on

research and new technologies. (Washington said it is prepared to share such results, but no specific proposal has yet been made.) An argument which is shared by all Europeans is that Mr Reagan cannot be prevented from carrying out research since no agreement in this sphere can be verified, and that it is better for him to carry out this research so that the Soviets do not have a monopoly of it.

France has also greatly reduced its hostility after being close to a quarrel with Washington on this point, especially in June 1984, when Paris submitted a plan for negotiation to the UN Disarmament Conference. It is no longer even customary to express alarm over the credibility of the French deterrent force, as people were doing until last year. In fact, this fear would be out of keeping with the argument which seems to have been adopted toward the SDI's feasibility.

Authoritative French circles are now saying essentially that defense against nuclear weapons will never provide a full or even adequate guarantee: The vulnerability of the systems to be deployed, the opportunities for saturation and countermeasures to which the assailant could resort, the vast technical problems to be solved to achieve defense against ballistic missiles alone, the existence of other vehicles which demand yet other systems of protection, and finally the enormous risk involved in even a minor failure of the defense system are such that it is futile to seek to "eliminate the nuclear threat," as the U.S. President aspires to do. This makes two attitudes possible.

One can resort to defense for partial protection alone, more specifically to strengthen the deterrent and not to eliminate it: This is what is behind the "limited" versions of the SDI being put forward by a large section of official American circles, and this is consistent with what Paris wants. France, which has no intention of giving its deterrent a counterforce character and of making Soviet silos its target, has no objection to those targets being protected.

Or, one can take President Reagan's enthusiasm at face value, but it is precisely this version of the SDI, the most sincere but also the most dangerous, for which Paris criticizes him. France, according to the same argument, does not think that the world can ever be freed from the threat of mutual annihilation—a threat which, moreover, paradoxically helps safeguard peace. It is therefore deceiving to paint such a glowing outlook for them, and it would also undermine a consensus on deterrence achieved with difficulty in many countries, especially in France. Even Mr Reagan cannot escape this dilemma since he must simultaneously defend his SDI and continue the difficult task of selling the American public and Congress the MX missile, the Trident supersubmarine, and the B-1 bomber, which are typical offensive weapons.

As can be seen, this analysis does not eliminate the Franco-American disagreements, but it at least defuses the problem by channeling the quarrel into rhetoric at the expense of substance. All things considered, Paris is no longer criticizing the U.S. President for doing what he is doing (and on this point France agrees with the European argument on the legitimacy of research), but for what he is saying.

This attitude may ultimately be proved right since the White House incumbent will probably change several times before the weapons the SDI heralds make their appearance. But it could not prevent France and its partners from considering this future and avoiding missing the boat--now setting sail--of the new space race.

CS0: 5200/2517

SPACE ARMS

HANDELSBLAD: U.S. 'ULTIMATUM' HIGHLIGHTS SDI CONTRADICTIONS

PM030943 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 28 Mar 85 p 9

[Editorial: "Confusion Over Star Wars"]

[Text] NATO defense ministers this week voiced their support for the research program for the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative, or star wars. But, as Dutch Defense Minister De Ruiter put it with great subtlety: All sorts of ministers voiced "marginal reservations, subsidiary considerations, and all manner of questions."

After the recent statements enlarging on their governments' positions from Genscher and Howe this could hardly be described as surprising.

However, what was surprising was the U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger's offer of participation in the proposed research, which had rather the character of an ultimatum. Countries interested have been invited to give an "indication" of this within 60 days. Anyone responding later will "not be disqualified," it was said in a belated attempt to remove the sharp edges from the invitation.

Too late, because the Germans, who during the NATO meeting had voiced a "clear 'yes,'" made it known next day that they do not feel bound by the term of 60 days. "We do not want to bet on the wrong horse, if we bet at all," said an aggrieved spokesman.

So a nice plan to create a common front against a Soviet Union characterized as recalcitrant deteriorated within a few hours into a bone of contention for international Western consumption.

This also directs abundant attention toward the contradictions in the SDI project. Apart from the different, if not divergent explanations delivered from the United States, uncertainty persists about what is intended with the plans at the present moment. Will the SDI be an essential subsidiary part of U.S. defenses, or could the system also become a bargaining chip in the negotiations with the Soviet Union, with the possibility that the program will never be implemented? The European side is bound to want to keep this possibility open.

The U.S. Administration is now strongly stressing the necessity of keeping alive the so-called ABM treaty which greatly limits defense against ICBM's, but it remains vague about the future of this agreement when and if the SDI moves out of the research stage. Distrust of Russian behavior in the last decade is vying for supremacy with cautious optimism with regard to the chances of an "understanding" in Geneva.

On the European side too the picture is not unambiguous. Not only because tender feelings are being snubbed by direct U.S. informing methods. There seems to be tension developing between the desire to grab a piece of the technological development necessary for SDI and caution as to the strategic and diplomatic consequences of the star wars concept.

After Luxembourg, where the ministers met this week, there also comes the call for European unanimity. The Western European Union is recommended as the forum in which this can be striven for and reached.

Thus British Foreign Secretary Howe's words seem to be of crucial significance: "We must take care that political decisions are not enfeebled in advance by the advances of technology, and even less by premature attempts to predict the direction of those advances."

Within the 60-day term which the Americans have fixed, Howe's call will have to be described in advance as fruitless. This is in itself a good reason to enlarge this term.

CSO: 5200/2547

SPACE ARMS

ROTTERDAM COMMENTATOR ON SDI TECHNOLOGICAL SPINOFFS

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 22 Feb 85 p 7

[Article by J. L. Heldring: "Beggars Can't Be Choosers"]

[Text] Last week in The Hague, Christoph Bertram, former director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, eloquently and almost convincingly outlined the military and political dangers lurking in President Reagan's plan for a watertight space defense.

Yet there is one aspect to which he scarcely drew attention in his address: it will not be certain until 10 or 15 years from now whether the plan will provide America with adequate protection and is thus worth implementing. But the \$26 billion that Reagan is sinking into research for it will itself—even if the plan turns out to not be feasible--unleash an industrial revolution.

Indeed, as General Berkhof wrote in this newspaper last 7 February, Reagan's plan signifies "a shot in the arm for electronics, aerospace technology and research in the area of fusion energy, together with biotechnology the spearhead of the coming century." The Europeans are going to have to take full account of this.

Because "if the West Europeans, for whatever reason, turn away from SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative, the official name of Reagan's plan), there is a large chance that a disengagement from the United States will take place, not only in the area of defense policy, but also in the technological and economic realm."

It is perhaps not too far-fetched to presume that, whatever Reagan's own motives may be, the benefits for American technology and industry of the studies of the plan's feasibility alone have been at least as powerful a motivation as the questionable military and strategic benefits.

This presumption is not too far-fetched because under Secretary Weinberger, defense has become the growth sector in the United States: 55 percent of all research and development is financed by the government, and the Pentagon accounts for the vast majority of it.

In other words, civilian technology and industry have also become to a large extent dependent on the defense budget. SDI is in line with this. Whatever its military and strategic significance may turn out to be, the research alone will give America, to the tune of \$26 billion, a giant leap on its biggest competitor: no, not the Soviet Union, but Japan.

Can the West Europeans afford to stay behind? Francois de Rose, one of France's former top diplomats, wrote in LE MONDE last 14 February, "You cannot hold back progress. And if this technology turns out to be the technology of tomorrow, the antimissiles will see the light of day, whether we think it is right or not.

"Rather than placing their hopes on a halt in the advance of science and technology, the Europeans would do well to study, on their own and with the Americans, how to allow their laboratories to benefit in the area of research, their factories in the area of production and employment, and their half continent in the area of security."

This was also an important motive for West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, in his speech at the conference of weapons clientele in Munich (see the article by Ben Knapen in the 11 February issue) to urgently advise the West Europeans to take part in SDI research. Two days later Weinberger said that his government would offer the Europeans allies participation in this research.

Mark it well: in this research. This is certainly something--and we should hope that the Netherlands has sufficiently qualified researchers to be involved in it--but the offer does not include participation in development. This means that technology transfer need not be counted on. This too is in line with Weinberger's policy, which is very restrictive, even with respect to the transfer of technologies that only indirectly have to do with defense.

But as the English saying goes, beggars can't be choosers. The West Europeans will thus to a large part have to rely on their own strength in order to not fall too far behind. This is the reasoning of President Mitterrand's idea for a European space defense--naturally laughed at in The Hague (where he put it forward a year ago).

Scepticism would have been better than merriment. When we see how Mitterrand's defense minister, Charles Hernu, in response to German questions in Munich concerning why French missiles are aimed at Germany, calmly said that Russian missiles are after all also aimed at Germany--an answer that was received by that dignified assemblage with hissing--then we are still far away from the European unity that implementation of Mitterrand's idea presupposes.

This unity is also far to seek elsewhere. In the Netherlands, the Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs differ in their opinions on SDI. And in Munich, SPD deputy Egon Bahr, who had at first passionately attacked SDI, acknowledged after an explanation by Edward Teller (who supposedly "sold" SDI to Reagan), "It is dangerous if the world no longer has the strength to

pursue such visions" (or "to look into"! The word "nachgehen" can mean either.). But his Dutch party colleague Klaas de Vries, PvdA [Labor Party] member of the Second Chamber, is, according to an interview in DE VOLKSKRANT (last 16 January), not even that far along yet (not unusual for a Netherlander).

In short, if SDI is dangerous to Europe, then it is rather for the time being in a technological and economic sense, and it is up to the West Europeans—at least in theory—to do something about it. If not, they will regress irrevocably to the status of an underdeveloped area.

And the Soviet Union? "The threatening military-technological surge from America is being utilized by the insistent economic reformers in the Soviet Union as a motive for economic structural improvements. There are some indications that the younger generation in the Kremlin is taking Reagan's challenge as inducement for forcing their own bureaucracy into drastic corrective measures," according to Christian Schmidt-Hauser, Russian expert for DIE ZEIT (last 1 February).

Is this a good development? Not necessarily. Dr G. K. Boon, director of the Technology Science Foundation in Noordwijk, writes in the INTERNATIONALE SPECTATOR (January 1985) that "an efficient Soviet Union...would signify a much greater threat to Western democracy, and thus no extra inducement should be provided by the West that (would) push the Soviet Union towards efficiency." Thus no SDI for this reason?

12271

CSO: 5200/2507

SPACE ARMS

NORWAY'S LABOR PARTY YOUTH CONGRESS: CHANGE NATO NUCLEAR STRATEGY

Departing Chairman Gives Views

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 23 Feb 85 p 22

[Article by Thorleif Andreassen]

[Excerpts] At the AUF (Labor Party Youth Organization) national congress the proposal to nationalize the banking industry met with strong objections.

Even though the national congress is divided over some issues, there is broad agreement among the 300 delegates regarding, among other things, the following claims: the government's policy in almost all areas is bad, the Labor Party's policy will include an offensive against unemployment.

Head-on Confrontation with NATO

"A Labor Party government must fight against NATO," demanded AUF leader Egil Knudsen. He disagreed with the idea that Norway should declare herself free of nuclear weapons in all situations unilaterally through an Act of Parliament. However, Knudsen made it clear that even if NATO should not agree to the steps taken, a Labor Party government must proceed with its work towards a nuclear-free zone in the North. He thought there was every reason to believe that much of the work for such a zone must be done in a head-on confrontation with NATO.

We asked the AUF leader what the priority would be if it came to a choice between the zone or NATO membership.

"I do not believe that such a situation will occur. Today, there are countries in the alliance which have more special situations than the absence of nuclear weapons. I am sure that the alliance will see the advantages of having Norway as a member in any case," Knudsen replied not wanting to speculate on what he characterizes as a hypothetical situation.

Incoming Chairman Against NATO-Membership

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 23 Feb 85 p 3

[Text] Tomorrow, Jens Stoltenberg will become the new AUF leader: Charming, intelligent, with quick answers. Outgoing, but not cocky. In contrast to his father, former Defense Minister Thorvald Stoltenberg, the 25-year-old student wants Norway to withdraw from NATO.

He now would like to influence the parent party towards pursuing a more active distribution and equalization policy.

"AUF hopes to achieve a breakthrough in this matter at the Labor Party's national congress in March," says Stoltenberg.

The incoming AUF leader does not have much spare time. But he gets in a little jogging nevertheless during his final stretch in the last part of his studies in social economics.

The dark-haired bundle of energy has been AUF deputy chairman for two years, leader of the international committee of the Youth Party for four years, and a member of the central governing body since 1979. But besides politics and studies, he also finds time for other things such as: evening duty as a journalist with the newspaper ARBEIDERBLADET and instruction of students enrolled in basic courses at the University at Blindern. Stoltenberg wrote his thesis on oil revenues and uncertainty.

Like his predecessor Egil Knudsen, Jens Stoltenberg is a likeable fellow. It looks as if the young socialist from Oslo's best west side will have a bright career in the parent party.

"I do not try to hide where I grew up. Because there is no reason for this. The fact that I come from the city's west side does not mean that I am isolated due to my background."

Nor does he conceal that his family background contributed to his entry into AUF.

"This is obvious. But I am interested in people judging me by what I do and say. Not by the fact that I am Thorvald's son."

"You are not a strong supporter of NATO".

"No, that is correct. It is the goal of AUF to break down the blocks and withdraw Norway from the alliance. However, we recognize at the same time that Norway will probably remain a NATO member for the next few years. Therefore, we will also make demands as to how Norway shall act as a member of the alliance. We must fight for a nuclear-free zone and a freeze on nuclear weapon arsenals."

"Is there a particular foreign policy which interests the incoming AUF leader?"

"No, I am intersted in the whole spectrum of political issues. The main concerns of AUF are also my main concerns, i.e. the fight against youth unemployment and the work for less expensive and more housing units."

We got Stoltenberg out from the hectic national congress hall and found a quiet corner. O well, quiet. hey there Jens, hallo, hallo...lively greetings and friendly faces indicate that he is an immensely popular fellow in the youth organization.

Resolution Supports 'Zone'

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 Feb 85 p 3

[Excerpts] On Sunday Jens Stoltenberg was elected the new chairman of the Labor Party's Youth Organization to succeed Egil Knudsen. The election was unanimous with no opposing candidate. By a large majority, the national congress rejected a proposal by the Troms AUF that Norway unilaterally declare herself a nuclear-free zone.

In a resolution on security policy AUF demands that the government disassociate itself from plans for further military armament in space.

Troms Initiative Rejected

Troms AUF had submitted a proposal that Norway should declare herself free of nuclear weapons unilaterally without first having negotiated guarantees from the nuclear powers that such a declaration would be respected. The proposal was rejected with 222 to 68 votes.

A Scandinavian nuclear-free zone must be guaranteed by the nuclear powers, the national congress felt. The guarantees must be supported by a thinning out and removal of nuclear weapons in the areas surrounding the zone. Besides, AUF says that of necessity the Scandinavian countries must proceed and establish a nuclear-free zone without taking into consideration the disarmament negotiations. They demand that the Parliament make a statement of intent that Norway would be part of such a zone. The national congress demands that NATO change its nuclear strategy.

Conservative Chairman Condemns Resolution

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 Feb 85 p 3

[Text]Discouraging, to say the least, that the AUF leadership does not use once the word cooperation with regard to the peacekeeping work in which Norway actively participates within the framework of the NATO defense alliance," says Conservative Party chairman Erling Norvik in a comment to AFTENPOSTEN. "Fight against " and "fight within" is the Young Socialists' formula for our position towards NATO.

Norvik points out that disagreement on many issues does exist within AUF, but clearly this does not apply to the goal to get Norway out of NATO.

According to the new leader, they "realize", however, that "Norway will probably remain a NATO member for the next few years." Therefore, for the time being the strategy must be for a Labor Party government "to fight against NATO," the departing leader was able to maintain. In Einar Forde's spirit and wording and under tremendous applause he said that there was every reason to believe that nuclear-free zones must be fought through in a head-on confrontation with NATO.

The conclusion was that regardless of what NATO might think the Labor Party must stick to its position.

We Exclude Ourselves

"It is, to say the least, discouraging that the AUF leadership does not use once the word cooperation with regard to the peacekeeping work in which we actively participate within the framework of the NATO defense alliance. "Fight within" and "fight against" is also the Young Socialists' formula for Norway's position towards NATO. Unity and the mutual commitments which are the prerequisite for NATO's strength are completely disregarded.

"If the AUF position—which unfortunately receives considerable fuel from the Labor Party's deputy chairman—becomes Norway's position, we will actively contribute to reducing Norway's options as they are pursued now in the work for a peacekeeping balance of power and controlled disarmament. Indeed, in reality we would have placed ourselves outside the peacekeeping work, while it is more important than ever to participate in it," stresses Norvik.

More Government Power

More government power at home and less peacekeeping work through NATO is the actual conclusion drawn at the AUF national congress. Can one imagine anything less future-oriented from a youth organization?

12831

CBO: 5200/2503

SPACE ARMS

ANDREOTTI ON MEETING WITH GORBACHEV

PM202056 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17-18 Mar 85 p 3

[Interview with Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti by Alberto Jacoviella in Rome; date not given]

[Excerpts] Rome--[Jacoviello] Indefatigable as you are, Mr Andreotti, you will have read what has been written about Gorbachev both in Italy and abroad. But, together with President Pertini, you are the only Italian politician to have spoken with him at the very moment, so to speak, that he took on the post of CPSU general secretary. Could you tell me about your first direct impressions?

[Andreotti] I gained the impression of someone of a very calm disposition with an analytical approach, with neither the dogmatic attitude nor the detachment that sometimes characterizes dealings between interlocutors belonging to different camps. Of course it would be presumptuous of me to draw any final biographical conclusions after a conversation lasting three-quarters of an hour. But that is my basic impression.

[Jacoviello] Could you tell me what you discussed?

[Andreotti] After President Pertini had made the appropriate remarks, I was able to comment on two of the points made by Gorbachev. I replied to his reference to the illogicality of continuing to deploy missiles while at the same time working for disarmament by pointing out that there is an imbalance and that the Soviet side must take up again the idea stated only once by Andropov of dismantling some of the SS 20's. With regard to the hope of a reduction of nuclear arsenals, I said that it is valid as long as it does not imply an increase in conventional weapons. We must work to cut world military spending, especially in our own countries. Gorbachev listened respectfully and it seemed to me, with some interest concerning the mention of Andropov's idea. Apart from this, we reasserted our adherence to the platform agreed by Shultz and Gromyko in January which is now embarking on its phase of development, partly "to avert the arms race in space."

[Jacoviello] Minister, the last time we met was in Washington, where you took part in the prime minister's meetings with President Reagan and authoritative representatives of his administration. This was virtually on the eve of your visit to Moscow. It was an extraordinary -- indeed unique -- experience. If you were to scrutinize it carefully, what conclusions would you draw with regard to prospects for USSR-U.S. relations?

[Andreotti] I believe that the desire to avert the dangers deriving from a state of tension and from an arms race -- apart from the risk of always possible mistakes -- is mutual. Obviously there are very many difficulties in reaching mutually acceptable accords but it is very important that both sides are aiming at the same result.

[Jacoviello] There is a central issue on which their stances seem very distant, however -- so-called star wars. The Americans say that they want to go ahead, while the Soviets reply that it would create a new arms race. Gorbachev himself has said so frequently. What is the solution?

[Andreotti] I believe that if we look carefully at President Reagan's repeated statements about the sharp separation between research and development we will find a guarantee reflected in the documents issued by the latest Atlantic Council meeting. In any case what does "research" mean? Of course on the one hand it is intended for military ends, though of a fairly defensive nature, whose feasibility is not yet clear, however. One major scientist told me, for instance, that it is no coincidence that they are talking in terms of an umbrella. This means that if the rain were heavy we would get splashed all the same. On the other hand there is a very important technological aspect which must not be ignored. In any case, the clause in the Shultz-Gromyko agreement about the commitment to avert an arms race in space is very significant. It constitutes a commitment in fact.

[Jacoviello] That does not alter the fact, minister, that there is widespread concern -- voiced by Prime Minister Craxi, for that matter -- that the results of the research should not lead to a USSR-U.S. military imbalance....

[Andreotti] There are also other concerns -- two in particular, I believe. The first is of a military nature, because if the umbrella in question were to be limited to certain areas -- those outside the umbrella would be exposed. This applies both to NATO countries and to Warsaw Pact countries. The second concern is of a more general nature. If the research, on which huge sums are being spent, were to take place outside Europe the technological gap would become much wider.

[Jacoviello] But do you not perceive an objective unity of interests between the West European countries and the USSR, inasmuch as, albeit from differing stances, they both hope that the results of the research will not be used exclusively or prevalently for military purposes?

[Andreotti] This is true, but this does not conflict with the basic U.S. line. Indeed, although the United States talks about a need to adjust the balance -- because there has been and still is an imbalance in the USSR's favor -- there are nevertheless no plans for regaining military superiority. I regard this as a positive guarantee.

CSO: 5200/2530

SPACE ARMS

L'UNITA VIEWS CRAXI VISIT TO WASHINGTON

PM121650 Rome L'UNITA in Italian 9 Mar 85 p 1

[Romano Ledda article: "Is There an Italian Foreign Policy?"]

[Excerpt]

"Another crucial subject is the so-called "star wars." As we have said several times, we do not wish to uphold the arguments of one political and military bloc against the other. Instead, our aim is to refrain from supporting a political concept of world relations which imprisons the world in a rigid bipolar framework — a military plan which is completely hypothetical and remote, but which has the immediate and visible effect of a new race for increasingly sophisticated and dangerous weapon systems. We want to put the following dilemma to the prime minister. Is it in the higher interest of peace to negotiate a third level of armaments (perhaps, as he says, to respond to "the relentless progress of science and technology," as if both should be linked to military ends and not to peace and welfare); or should the choice be to negotiate reduction of the existing, abnormal nuclear arsenals? In this sphere "interests," "understandings," "support," and even "ambiguity" are not justifiable, since it is no exaggeration to say that individual choices determine destinies which go beyond states. Blocs and alliances affect the whole of mankind for the coming decades. In this case too, saying such elementary things is compatible with our position as allies.

CSO: 5200/2532

SPACE ARMS

PCI AIDE SAYS SDI MEANS 'CERTAIN ESCALATION'

M0271023 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 20 Mar 85 p 4

[Article by Gianluca Devoto of the PCI's Foreign Policy Studies Center: "Guaranteed Arms Race"]

[Text] It is easy enough to imagine the negative consequences of a possible proliferation of strategic defense systems (whether or not based in space): 1 -- a new and vigorous phase of nuclear rearmament, in which the traditional U.S.-USSR rivalry would be further nurtured by the race between offensive and defensive weapons (among other things, the ABM strategic defense system would sooner or later be joined by antileisure missile systems); 2 -- the violation and therefore abandonment or drastic limitation of the ABM treaty (the only U.S.-USSR accord that really has a limiting force in a particular category of weapons), which limits to 100 the number of ABM missiles permitted; 3 -- increased difficulties, including technical difficulties, in finding forms of agreement on the entire dispute over strategic weapons.

These forecasts seem well founded. For instance, to avert the exacerbation of strategic competition on all fronts the two superpowers should proceed by common accord in research into and development of these new weapons. One certainly does not need to be a pessimist to regard such a prospect as entirely unrealistic. Soviet reactions in recent months are indicative.

Moreover recent history provides an instructive instance: In 1970 the United States for the first time deployed MIRV's, which are now regarded as the prime cause of strategic instability even by Kissinger, who at that time supported them. The main argument in favor of their deployment was that MIRV's provided a guarantee of being able to penetrate the primitive ABM defense systems that the Soviets were installing around Moscow and that were subsequently limited by the ABM treaty. This is a clear example of how any reference to the defense capability of either of the two rivals prompts the adversary, almost through a conditioned reflex, to strengthen his own offensive capability.

It seems unnecessary to me to emphasize how much the entire international situation would deteriorate in the presence of a U.S.-USSR arms race that had undergone a further qualitative lead forward and was increasingly uncontrolled.

The nature of the supposed security advantages argued by the advocates of Reagan's (SDI) initiative remain to be seen. There is no doubt that a perfect strategic defense that made all possible targets (civilian, industrial, and military) invulnerable would make nuclear weapons pointless, thus freeing us of their nightmare. But it must be

realized that in a competitive situation such a defense is impossible to achieve -- in the nuclear context the advantages of offense (which can choose where to strike with the most varied kinds of missiles) over defense (which should protect everything) are crucial and insurmountable. It is perhaps conceivable that in 30 years' time a complete strategic shield will be possible against existing weapons -- but certainly not against those that will have to be dealt with then.

Having ruled out the hypothesis of a perfect and total defense, used by the Reagan administration mainly for propaganda purposes, there remains the hypothesis of a partial defense -- partial as to either coverage of targets or level of protection. This seems feasible within certain limits. The defense network in the case would serve to make land-based ICBM's less vulnerable to an enemy first strike. Retaliatory capability and therefore deterrence would thus be increased.

This appears to be a convincing argument. In fact it is deliberately defective. Actually the defense system could serve as protection, at least partial, against a nuclear response for anyone launching a first strike. This is why any development of a strategic defense appears to many scholars intrinsically dangerous and destabilizing. While admitting that it is a controversial issue, it is worth noting that the ABM treaty was concluded by pursuing this latter line of reasoning and that in any case even the quest for a lesser nuclear vulnerability always raises the enemy's worse suspicions and is profoundly dangerous in this respect at least.

Overall, I do not believe there should be any doubts. Once Reagan's initiative has really taken off it will have effects that are difficult not to describe as disastrous. To reach such a conclusion there is no need to believe that the United States wants to rule or regain a strategic superiority that for years now has been a mirage for everyone.

Be that as it may, it would be a mistake to give in to pessimism. There is a large gap between the rhetoric of U.S. Administration spokesmen and the actual facts. Even the provision of a partial defense of doubtful usefulness will involve very high costs and take a very long time (about 20 years). Furthermore, the overall level of consensus within the Western establishment is certainly low -- much lower than in the case of the baronies. In the United States opposition to the SDI extends to circles much broader than the traditional advocates of arms control; in Europe the allied governments are displaying signs of significant uncertainties; and only a minority of students support these U.S. projects.

It is by no means unlikely that the Reagan program will crumble at the end of 1989, after the first phase of research and development, which is expected to cost \$26 billions. This could be the consequence of a political rethink, of disappointing results in terms of cost efficiency, or even of possible accords with the Soviet Union. In any case it is certain that the early nineties will be crucial to the continuation or otherwise of the entire initiative.

However justified one's skepticism about the weight of the influences coming from our continent, the European left should make a thoroughgoing and constructive commitment to the struggle against the SDI. To this end there is certainly no point in lending credence to certain eccentric ideas such as the elimination of the balance of terror by means of strategic defense. Freedom from the balance of terror and of deterrence will be possible only when there are no longer any nuclear weapons -- unfortunately a very far-off objective, for which it is necessary to lay groundwork which is mainly political, not technical.

In this connection, within the context of matters of security and defense there is an ever increasing awareness of the need for new ideas that are neither generic nor utopian but that are not too respectful of an unsatisfactory reality either.

SPACE ARMS

ACADEMICS WRITE ON SDI IN EUROPEAN PAPERS

Aleksey Arbatov in L'UNITA

PD040906 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 12 Mar 85 p 6

[Article by Aleksey Arbatov, "professor of history and department director in the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations": "Global War More Likely"]

[Text] From what kind of nuclear strike does the United States want to defend itself: from a first strike or a retaliatory strike? When representatives of the administration broach such "details" publicly they of course give assurance what it would be a defense against a hypothetical "first strike" by the other side. But how do things actually stand?

Let us begin with the fact that the Soviet Union has pledged never to use nuclear weapons first, whereas the United States has not followed this example.

Now let us suppose that the colossal technical and economic problems have been resolved one way or another and that the simultaneous interception of thousands of ICBM's by orbiting laser stations has become possible in principle. Nevertheless, the politico-military and strategic-military consequences of the development and implementation of such weapons systems would be very different from what the U.S. leadership is trying to show by promising Americans tranquillity and security thanks exclusively to fantastic new technology.

First, the development of space systems of antimissile defense in several stages could create an extremely dangerous illusion of supremacy in the United States and of relative invulnerability to nuclear weapons that would soon be dispelled. In a crisis situation this is liable to prompt steps to be taken for the practical attainment of temporary supremacies on the political and even military planes.

Long before the space antimissile system could, thanks to its scope and technical performance, guarantee defense against a massive nuclear first strike, it would probably create the illusion of a theoretical capacity to repulse a retaliatory strike [already] severely weakened by warning salvos against the other side's strategic forces and their command and coordination systems. It is precisely this increased first strike potential that constitutes the chief aim of the Reagan administration's measures in the field of offensive strategic weapons and forward-based medium-range weapons.

Moreover, the development and application of space antimissile systems would spark off intensive programs in the sphere of means and methods designed to counter these space antimissile systems. At least during a foreseeable phase coinciding with the first generations of space antimissile systems, such means will be much cheaper and simpler than the antimissile system itself. In this connection the development of the space counterweapons race will incomparably increase the threat of an armed conflict exploding in a crisis situation, which would lead to the virtually immediate escalation of military actions with foreseeable consequences.

Even if the space antimissile system were capable of intercepting a substantial number of missiles, this would be unlikely to reduce absolute losses in the event of war. The special nature of the nuclear weapons, which sets it apart from all previous means of mass destruction, lies in the fact that owing to its vast destructive potential even a small number of missiles penetrating the defense system could inflict an unprecedented number of losses. Therefore, irrespective of the subsequent development of the competition between attack and defense, which has seen alternating success in the course of history, the deployment of the space antimissile system certainly does not promise to reduce in real terms the absolute damage suffered by its possessor in the event of war. On the contrary it is more likely to increase it, since the development of the space antimissile system could prompt the strengthening, improvement, and diversification of offensive nuclear weapons.

Last, the dialectic of the deployment and improvement of the space antimissile system, the introduction of ever-improved models with an increasingly high destructive yield, could in time directly transform military orbiting stations into a threatening offensive weapon capable of launching an attack from space on the politico-military leadership's armed forces, industrial installations, infrastructures and population, and various objectives on land, at sea, in the air, and in space. This terrible weapon would loom over us constantly and would essentially have instantaneous speed of action.

The foregoing observations are confirmed by the calculations and conclusions of the report of the committee of Soviet scientists in defense of peace and against nuclear war published in 1984.

The development of new antimissile systems and particularly of space-based systems, notwithstanding the Reagan administration's declarations, will not replace the "containment of the threat of a nuclear strike" with containment "by means of direct defense against it," will not facilitate arms limitation, and will not strengthen security. All these promises are addressed to naive or ill-informed people. These "simple" solutions have never worked in the past and will not work in the future.

The development of space antimissile systems would, first, considerably accelerate and expand the arms race in both defensive and offensive weapons and would cause truly astronomic wastage of material and intellectual resources. It would immeasurably complicate the ascertainment and forecast of the balance of military forces and increase the mutual uncertainty, insecurity, and fears of both sides. The efforts to restrain the arms race and existing and probable future accords in this field would be irredeemably lost. Under certain conditions there would be a much greater likelihood of the outbreak of a global war.

Obviously, without an accord on averting an arms race in space it is difficult to reach a mutually acceptable solution on other kinds of weapons, too. This, among other things, was stressed recently by Andrey Gromyko, who said that "the issue of strategic weapons or of medium-range nuclear weapons cannot be examined without examining the issue of space, or more precisely, the issue of averting the arms race in space."

Bogdanov in Dutch Paper

PM151411 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 12 Mar 85 p 9

[USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute Deputy Director Radomir Bogdanov article: "Soviet Thoughts on the Geneva Arms Talks"]

[Text] The fate of the world depends in many respects on the question of whether a way will be found to prevent an arms race in space and to end the arms race on earth. On the initiative of the Soviet Union the objective of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations, due to begin 12 March in Geneva, has been formulated thus.

What is at stake is the most important question of our time. For success a complex approach is indispensable, and it must recognize the interconnections between the solutions to questions in the field of space and nuclear arms. Herein lies the fundamental significance of the agreements reached in Geneva in January this year. There are no reasonable alternatives to such an approach. Without the absence of the militarization of space it is impossible to end the process of the accumulation of stockpiles of nuclear and other weapons. This is precisely where the shoe pinches. The negotiations have still not begun and already there has been a swarm of statements by prominent persons in the United States that the gigantic rearmament program will continue. They have no desire to set aside all the plans to transport the arms race into space.

The Soviet Union has no illusions: The negotiations will be difficult, but may hopeless fatalism remain alien to us. Our side is honestly prepared to make its contribution to a path of mutually acceptable agreements. In this connection fundamental importance must be attached to the interpretation Konstantin Chernenko has given of the Soviet Union's approach to the forthcoming negotiations.

First: The Soviet Union is not striving for military superiority over the United States and the NATO countries.

Second: The Soviet Union wants the end of the arms race and for this reason has raised for discussion first steps such as the freeze of nuclear arsenals of the negotiating parties, a halt to the further deployment of missiles, and so on.

Third: The Soviet Union wants a real reduction in arms stockpiles, and initially a significant reduction. The Soviet Union is against the stockpiling of new weapons systems, both in space and on earth, offensive or so-called defensive. At the same time it is striving toward the final goal -- the total abolition of nuclear arms everywhere.

Fourth: It would be of extraordinary significance if the nuclear powers were to enter a binding agreement that in their mutual relations they would live up to norms which would be able to prevent the danger of a nuclear catastrophe, and if, in the 40th year since the end of World War II, they were together to confirm in letter and spirit the commitments made by the leaders of the USSR and the United States which went down in history as the beginning of 10 years of detente.

The true wisdom of those who stand at the head of their states is to be found in their readiness to reject totally the frightful danger threatening us from space and, in general terms, to reject war as a method for resolving international conflicts; in their preparedness to guarantee peace for all peoples, regardless of their social

system, ideology, and world outlook. This is what is called "peaceful coexistence" in the Soviet Union.

The point is that people on the other side of the ocean will have to be prepared honestly to solve these problems on the basis of parity and equal security. The USSR has every reason to promote these goals.

Where are the guarantees that the United States will not use the negotiations as a shield behind which attempts will be made to win military superiority over the Soviet Union and that the negotiations will not again be steered into a blind alley? Is it not a fact that in the past agreements already reached have been overturned at will or declared "invalid"? Time will tell how far the situation has changed in this respect.

CSO: 5200/1046

SPACE ARMS

LEUSCHNER ON U.S. 'STAR WARS'

DW261109 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1800 GMT 25 Feb 85

[Gunter Leuschner's weekly international review]

[Excerpts] Two weeks prior to the beginning of the Geneva talks and in the context of election rallies in the Soviet Union, Soviet politicians have once again presented their country's basic stance vis-a-vis these negotiations. We want the ending not the continuation of the arms race, we do not seek military superiority, we do not need it because we do not seek to force our will on anyone.

We seek the elimination of the largest possible number of arms, with no new weapons systems either on earth or in space. These three basic principles are to be found in Konstantin Chernenko's statement, along with another idea which one wishes that the addressee, the United States, would take up. Is it not possible, asks Chernenko, for the leading representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States to honor the 40th anniversary of the end of the most terrible and destructive of all previous wars by jointly reaffirming the substance and spirit of the commitments which the two countries undertook at the end of the war as well as later in the agreements of the seventies? What is primarily meant here is the Soviet-American treaty to prevent a nuclear war. It seems to me that the realization of this proposal would be more than just a gesture. It would be appropriate to the significance of this day and would allow us to forget some of the shameful things that have been said and done in the West prior to the 40th anniversary of the liberation, and would also be a kind of commitment to the negotiations in Geneva. It is all the more regrettable that precisely this passage of Chernenko's statement has so far received no response from the United States and has been almost completely ignored by the Western press as well.

Generally speaking, one is increasingly forced to come to the conclusion that in Washington, 2 weeks prior to Geneva, they are preoccupied less with the preparations for this conference, still less with the creation of a favorable climate for the course of negotiations, and more with disseminating propaganda about star wars. Everything seems to be focused on the search for allies for this program, on the elimination of all internal and external resistance to the outer space plans. Reagan's comment last week that the U.S. program for militarizing space would not be subject to negotiation in Geneva, as well as the demonstrative rescheduling of the testing of such weapons to dates 2 years earlier than previously planned, are intended to create the impression that any form of resistance is senseless and that the U.S. Administration is determined to stand its ground on this question in any event. But the very haste with which the U.S. proceeds without taking into consideration the effects on Geneva at all -- this haste also shows uncertainty.

The Pentagon has not so far been able to break resistance at home to the gigantic expenditure which will have to be incurred in connection with the star wars program. On the contrary, concern about the huge budget deficit must cause the administration to fear that resistance will increase still further in the coming months; it is for this reason that Washington is seeking to gain the support of its allies, and not without some success. Of course, the very fact that this project is so controversial even in the United States provides the West European governments with another reason for expressing their rejection clearly.

If one considers all the factors together -- resistance in the United States, unease in most allied countries, the demands raised by the neutral countries, the willingness of the Soviet Union to accept an immediate ban on the militarization of space, the mood of world public opinion, and the hopes raised in Geneva, which will all vanish without such a ban -- then it must be possible to prevent star wars.

There is no reason to be deceived by the self-assurance displayed openly by some politicians in the United States. Behind this self-assurance there is more uncertainty and nervousness, more fear of -- as an American newspaper put it in the last few days -- an increasing arms allergy than one would like to admit.

CSO: 5200/3018

SPACE ARMS

PREMISES, FRG SUPPORT OF SDI CRITICIZED

DW210703 East Berlin Television Service in German 2005 GMT 18 Mar 85

[Karl-Eduard von Schnitzler's "Der Schwarze Kanal" program, interspersed with clips from West German television involving preparations for, and West German reaction to, President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative]

[Excerpts] The designation Strategic Defense Initiative is misleading, dear viewers. If this were true there would not be any need for Geneva negotiations on the militarization of outer space or, to be more specific, on the prevention of star wars.

This, after all, is the positive development: One has come to terms on negotiating on intermediate-range nuclear weapons, strategic nuclear weapons, and on space weapons in a complex. One delegation from each of the two sides is supposed to negotiate on these problems in a complex of three groups. After all, it is impossible to negotiate on strategic nuclear weapons without talking about intermediate-range nuclear weapons.

U.S. intermediate missiles such as the Pershing II and cruise missiles, for instance, can reach strategic targets in the Soviet Union and, if deployed in West Europe instead of in the United States, assume strategic character. Soviet intermediate-range missiles, for instance those of the SS-20 variety, cannot reach the United States from central Europe.

On the other hand, it is impossible to negotiate with any chance of success on questions concerning different nuclear weapons systems if it is not possible to keep outer space free from such weapons. The Hamburg magazine STERN recently wrote about the U.S. contention that the militarization of outer space involves a strategic defense initiative: The United States, then impregnable, would have the capability to destroy the power centers of the Soviet Union with its MX and Minuteman missiles. But it is necessary to add: or with the Pershing II and cruise missiles deployed in West Europe.

Dear viewers, this star wars project proceeds from two premises: the command of the laser ray as a weapon, and the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union. Both are wrong. The United States has for years been experimenting with the laser weapon, but without success to date. Granted, the Americans can guide bombs to their targets with a laser ray -- they have done this already in Vietnam -- but to this day they can not master the laser ray as a weapon. The contention that the Soviet Union might attack the United States, that the Soviet Union would carry out a first strike and begin a war, the lie of the century about the danger from the East, the Russian bogeyman -- all this becomes no truer with constant repetition. There is nobody in socialism/communism who would profit from armament, war preparation, and war. There is no stock exchange there on which arms shares are traded, nor are there any armies which want foreign countries, wealth, and zones of influence.

By the way, even if FRG television occasionally voices criticism internally or externally against phenomena in its own society or that of the allies, this does not change the fact that it diligently engages in anti-Soviet agitation and slander, disseminates anticommunism, and, despite occasional skepticism springing from understandable misgivings, on principle considers good and appropriate and strongly propagandizes, the U.S. overkill and space armament.

The public transport company NASA carries spy satellites into space on secret missions. These listening devices are supposed to find out where it is best to start the star wars, and all media help, the press, radio, television, computer war games -- all of them crying: Russian scare. They paint a threat from the East so that they can speak of defense, of a strategic defense offensive [as heard] which is so very necessary in space.

Andrey Gromyko, in the context of U.S. space plans, termed the word defense hypocritical. In truth, he said, this is an aggressive plan. To gloss over this fact the FRG media are now construing subtle differences between research, development, and deployment. This may sound logical but nevertheless is very transparent.

Meanwhile, more contradictions constantly come to light. They say that one must not incur a technological lag vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Well, has not the argument so far always been that the Russians are hopelessly inferior technologically? They say that they want to participate in U.S. research and exchange scientific findings, and that they might exert influence on the United States. These people obviously do not know Rogers, Weinberger, and their ilk very well, let alone the military-industrial complex.

The United States demands propagandistic assistance and financial participation for protection in space under partnership; protection under partnership: Do I hear anybody laughing?

Bundeswehr ex-General Schmueckle is indeed right when he says: If we join we are part of it, we are in it. Well, perhaps a bit in the business -- that may be true for a few people, certainly not as far as scientific participation is concerned, but definitely so in the deadly risk. This is why resistance is vital for survival.

It is for this reason that Mitterrand's no is good for France, Europe, and peace, that the approval for further deployment wrought from the Belgian Government is regrettable, and that the Geneva negotiations are so significant.

The success of these negotiations, as hard as it may be to achieve, as long as it may take to reach it, and as much patience and goodwill as it will require on the Western side, is extremely important. Mankind knows perfectly well why it is looking toward Geneva with such great expectations. What is at stake is life, the survival of mankind. After all, the next, a third, peace would be a peace without any human beings.

In that respect no illusions, incantations, guardian angels, or prayer will help. All that helps is struggle, the peace struggle on all fronts.

CSO: 5200/3018

SPACE ARMS

PRC WARNS OF SPACE WAR AT DISARMAMENT TALKS

OW270313 Beijing XINHUA in English 0233 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, March 26 (XINHUA) -- China said here today that an arms race in outer space can only bring greater instability to the world, further aggravate international relations and increase the possibility of war.

Addressing today's session of the disarmament conference here, head of the Chinese delegation Qian Jiadong noted that the two superpowers are putting huge amounts of manpower and financial and material resources into the research and production of more sophisticated space weapons, in addition to the hundreds of existing military satellites and space weaponry systems.

If the arms race is not arrested, he warned, outer space will become a new battlefield if and when a new world war breaks out.

Introducing a working document on arms control in space prepared for the conference by the Chinese delegation, Qian said, "China is opposed to any arms race, hence also an arms race in outer space. China holds that the exploration and use of outer space should, in the interest of mankind, serve to promote the economic, scientific and cultural development of all countries. Outer space is universally recognized as the common heritage of mankind."

China favors the principles of the demilitarization of space. The Chinese proposal includes "the prohibition of developing, testing, producing, deploying and using space weapons, and the destruction of all existing space weapons."

He reaffirmed that the United States and the Soviet Union bear special responsibility for the prevention of an arms race in outer space because they possess the largest space potentials and are stepping up research and testing on space weapons.

He urged the two superpowers to show a real political willingness for serious negotiations to produce positive results which will benefit world peace and security.

The Chinese delegation also proposed that "all states having space capabilities refrain from developing, testing or deploying outer space weapons in order to create conditions and an atmosphere propitious to negotiations."

The conference began on February 5 to discuss a halt to the nuclear arms race on earth and in space, the prevention of nuclear war, the prohibition of chemical weapons and other issues.

SPACE ARMS

XINHUA ANALYZES EUROPEAN VIEWS OF 'STAR WARS' PLAN

OW251933 Beijing XINHUA in English 1847 GMT 25 Mar 85

["News Analysis: U.S.-European Relations Face New Test Over Star Wars (by Xia Zhimian)"]--XINHUA headline]

[Text] Bonn, March 25 (XINHUA) -- The difference between the United States and its West European allies on the U.S. "star wars" program has become apparent with the resumption of the U.S.-Soviet arms reduction talks in Geneva.

Recently, Federal German leaders have made a series of statements on the U.S. star wars program indicating their uneasiness. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that it is important to maintain the unity of Western alliance strategy so as to prevent instability. Chancellor Helmut Kohl expressed his hope that the U.S.-Soviet Geneva talks would make definite progress so as to make the U.S. star wars program unnecessary.

Warning the German people not to consider the U.S. program simply from the angle of technology, president of the Federal Germany Richard Von Weizsaecker cautioned them not to embrace the program in a hurry. All these comments show that German leaders want to keep an arm's length from the U.S. program.

Considering that the French Government has announced its opposition to the U.S. program and British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe has ironically called it a "Maginot Line of the 21st century," it can be said that the West European allies differ from the U.S. in their views on star wars.

First, West European countries have contended that if the U.S. space defense system becomes more reliable, the Soviets might in response step up their efforts in developing their own offensive system. The U.S. program cannot but escalate the arms race between the two superpowers.

Secondly, they also doubt whether the U.S. defensive system could effectively protect their countries since Soviet missiles can take a much shorter time to hit their territories than the United States.

Third, they ask, if the Western military strategy shifts from the present mass nuclear retaliation to the reliance on a space defense system, how can the West European countries counter the Soviet superiority in conventional forces?

CSO: 5200/4011

SPACE ARMS

WEST EUROPEANS PONDER PARTICIPATION IN 'STAR WARS'

OWO11305 Beijing XINHUA in English 1140 GMT 1 Apr 85

["Commentary: A Hot Potato (by Xia Ximian)"--XINHUA headline]

[Text] Bonn, April 1 (XINHUA) — Many West European capitals are pondering their recent invitation from the United States to participate in the American "star wars" program. They are reluctant to answer within the 60 days suggested by the U.S., not because they wish to snub President Reagan or are indifferent. The decision is a "hot potato".

In spite of all the publicity during the past two years, details of the "star wars" program are still very vague. It is a case of asking a man to marry before he sees his bride, as one observer put it. West German sources said that no decision would be made before Chancellor Helmut Kohl receives more details from U.S. President Ronald Reagan in May when they meet.

Whether the "star wars" system will actually prevent or promote disarmament is big question for the West European countries. The Reagan administration claims that the progress the Americans have made in space weapons research is the major factor that prodded the Soviets back to the negotiating table in Geneva. But they also said they had felt compelled to catch up with Soviet space anti-missile technology developed in early 1970s, thus acknowledging that the "star wars" effort is indeed part of the arms race.

West Europeans believe that if they agree to join the U.S. program, they will be caught in this circular logic.

The power that controls superiority in defense weapons has an advantage in the arms race today. The Soviets obviously would not tolerate a U.S. advantage and therefore the arms race would be pushed to a new stage. Western partnership in the U.S. program would band them as participants in the arms race.

West European governments are also disturbed that the "star wars" system would protect only the United States. If each of the two superpowers has a safe shield against missiles, the danger of a local war in Europe could intensify and Western Europe might have to fight a Soviet conventional attack.

In the 1970s, former Federal German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt called attention to the European nuclear "grey area" and urged the U.S. to include the Soviet Europe-based medium-range missiles in their nuclear disarmament talks. He feared a disconnection in defense between the U.S. and the Western Europe. Now the U.S. "star wars" program may create a new division of opinion on allied defence policy.

The interests of the Europeans in the "star wars" program would be economic as well as political and strategic. Military technologies are inseparable from civil technologies.

The 26 billion U.S. dollars the Reagan administration intends to spend on space defence research is bound to accelerate the development of other new technologies in the U.S. and bolster U.S. industry.

Participating West European countries would undoubtedly reap some of these benefits and profits. If they stand by and refuse to cooperate they are likely to see Japan benefit. To a Western Europe trying to catch up with the U.S. and Japan in the field of new technology, this is a challenge indeed, and an opportunity as well.

Reagan has presented a thorny proposition to his Western allies on the issue of the "star wars" system at a time when they have not yet settled the European deployment of U.S. missiles.

As members of the European Community exchanged views on the matter at a summit Saturday, official sources and public opinion were demanding a unified stance by the West-European countries. This may be the only choice for a Western Europe caught between the contending superpowers.

CSO: 5200/4014

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

SDI STANCE--[passage omitted] As far as the SDI issue is concerned up to now the Netherlands has chiefly distinguished itself by its political passivity. This attitude cannot be maintained now that not only is Washington pushing the project so hard but the West European allies are also getting ready to define their position. Bearing in mind the state of the European discussion, what will be important here is how the conditions for possible future participation in the SDI research will be formulated. Precisely because of the need for the effective promotion of joint European interests -- such as the reduction of the East-West tension and consequently the negotiability of the whole SDI project -- it would be nice if in this connection The Hague were able to avoid the Scylla of docile compliance and the Charybdis of simple noninvolvement. [Excerpt] [Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 29 Mar 85 p 3]

NO TO 'STAR WARS'--Representatives of the deans of Greek universities left yesterday for Geneva in order to deliver to the U.S. and USSR delegation a proclamation against "Star Wars" recently signed by all the deans and deputy deans of our country's institutions of higher learning. The delegation includes the dean of the Higher Agricultural School of Athens, Al. Poulouvasilis, and the deputy dean of Athens University, G. Filokyprou. As is known, following the decision of the committee of intellectuals of the World Peace Council, the proclamation of the Greek deans and deputy deans, which has already been signed by hundreds of university professor, intellectuals and scientists of our country, will be the basis for a similar proclamation by the intellectuals of the entire world. [Text] [Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 27 Mar 85 p 1]

ARMS DOCUMENT GIVEN TO USSR--Moscow 11 March (TASS)--The Ambassador of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the USSR Syed Najmuddin Hashim has handed over for keeping to the Government of the USSR documents on the joining by the People's Republic of Bangladesh of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater of 5 August 1963 as well as the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and on their destruction of 10 April 1972. The documents have been received by the Secretary General of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Yuriy Fokin. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1954 GMT 11 Mar 85 LD]

CSO: 5200/4700

23 April 1985

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR RUMORED 'WILLING' TO DISCUSS SS-20'S WITH NETHERLANDS

AU231625 Paris AFP in English 0402 GMT 23 Mar 85

[Text] The Hague, Netherlands, March 23 (AFP)—The Soviet Union is willing to hold talks with the Netherlands on the number of SS-20 missiles deployed in Soviet territory and on means to verify the number, according to a Dutch businessman reputed to have high-level contacts in the Kremlin. The Netherlands is scheduled to decide in November whether to deploy North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) missiles in its territory. The center-right government has said it would not deploy the missiles if the Soviet Union did not deploy more missiles after June 1984.

The businessman, a Mr Van Eeghen, told the Dutch news agency ANP that he had talks this week with "several" Soviet leaders, including the director of the International Information Department of the Communist Party's Central Committee. Foreign Minister Hans Van Den Broek said Friday that he had asked his Soviet counterpart, Andrey Gromyko, for a meeting to discuss East-West relations and arms control.

CSO: 5200/1054

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PARLIAMENT DISCUSSES BELGIAN MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

PM261505 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD In Dutch 21 Mar 85 p 3

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "Lubbers Considers Influence on Soviet Union to Be Greater After Belgian Missile Decision"]

[Text] The Hague, 21 Mar -- The Belgian decision to deploy 16 cruise missiles increases the chance that the Soviet Union will take the Netherlands cruise missile decision seriously, Prime Minister Lubbers said in the Second Chamber yesterday in response to questions from Mrs Grouwer (Communist Party of the Netherlands). She was annoyed that Lubbers praised the Belgian decision last week before the Belgian Parliament had expressed its view of it.

Lubbers pointed out that in the 1979 NATO two-track decision, Belgium had committed itself to carrying out the deployment, while the Netherlands had expressed reservations. He stressed that NATO countries must maintain the positions that they have adopted. "Predictability and clarity in the decisionmaking process have a positive influence on the arms control process and are very important in discouraging the Soviet Union from deploying SS-20's," he said.

Lubbers was not completely in agreement with the opposition speakers on this point. Ter Beek (Labor Party), Van der Spek (Pacifist Socialist Party) and Mrs Berkens (Political Party of Radicals) did not think it logical that the Netherlands itself should have given a "signal" to the Soviet Union by postponing a decision until 1 November 1985, while praising Belgium for the decision to deploy. For this reason Ter Beek described the Netherlands evaluation of the deployment in Belgium as "ambivalent." "The Netherlands wants to give a signal itself by not deploying yet. You would then think that it would like to see that signal reinforced by decisions in other countries," Ter Beek said. The Dutch "signal" is that the Netherlands postponed a decision in the latter half of 1984 and that cruise missiles will be deployed in Maastricht in 1985 only if on 1 November 1985 there are more than 728 SS-20's deployed on the Soviet side and the Geneva negotiations have still not produced any results.

Referring to this position Lubbers said: "The implementation of deployment in Belgium will have made it clear to the Soviet Union that something like that (deployment) is also possible in the Netherlands." Later he added: "If Belgium had deviated from the decision, the Netherlands position would have been devalued in the eyes of the Soviet Union. Second Chamber Deputy de Boer (Christian Democratic Appeal) said that, if it had not deployed, Belgium would have broken the solidarity of the alliance.

CSO: 5200/2536

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MARTENS STATEMENT TO PARLIAMENT ON CRUISE DECISION

LD151538 Brussels Domestic Service in French 1404 GMT 15 Mar 85

[Statement by Prime Minister Martens to the Parliament on government policies, including the decision to deploy cruise missiles in Belgium; in Flemish with superimposed French translation--live]

[Excerpt] Based on everything that has gone before, the government has reached the conclusion that, in accordance with the government statement of 18 December 1981, it must confirm today the decision of 12 December 1979 and 19 December 1981, made in solidarity with the allies. It has therefore agreed to the deployment of the first 16 [cruise] missiles.

The government, however, insists that this decision has no aggressive or hostile character. [boos] The deployment in Western Europe of a limited number of medium-range missiles, a number far lower than that already deployed by the USSR, is aimed solely at restoring a certain balance of forces and a deterrence without which the country's security would be seriously threatened. The government [boos] would have preferred this security to have been through a balanced agreement between East and West, and it will continue to work toward this end. It is aware, however, that the nonobservance of the agreed timetables would not influence the negotiations in the desired direction of a substantial reduction of the threat to Western Europe.

In its consistent search for a negotiated solution, the government reiterates strongly that any deployment of missiles in Belgian territory is reversible. It can be stopped, or the missiles can be completely dismantled should the agreements stemming from the negotiations require it.

The Government will respect the international commitments to which Belgium is bound. In this spirit, the government declares that the effective use of missiles deployed in our territory can only be accomplished in the strictest observance, on the one hand, of the procedures of consultation and decision-making provided within NATO and, on the other hand, of the international treaties and commitments to which Belgium has subscribed. In this context, it must be stressed that the Atlantic alliance is purely defensive and that the treaty setting it up refers explicitly to the right of legitimate defense provided for in the UN Charter.

NATO solemnly stated in the May 1984 Washington Declaration that none of its weapons will ever be used except to answer aggression. It results from this that the conventional or nuclear weapons situated in Belgian territory will never be used by NATO to carry out aggression.

The cruise missiles are assigned to NATO. Procedures are provided within this organization both for collective consultations between allies and for a decision [unexplained 2 second break in transmission]. It is therefore out of the question that a NATO member state would decide to use the missiles, breaching these procedures. In any case, it is only as a measure of riposte and as a last resort that nuclear weapons deployed in our territory could be used against targets limited to the positions of the attacker and to the infrastructure helping such attack.

Apart from the already ratified international agreements, the government will ask the Parliament to approve the additional protocol to the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 signed by Belgium on the 10 June 1977.

CSO: 5200/2525

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PARTY DAILY ATTACKS KOHL'S DEPLOYMENT DECISION

AU261655 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 23-24 Feb 85 p 2

[A.Z. commentary: "Mr Kohl and Steadfastness; 'Decision of the Century' Against the Interests of the Peoples"]

[Text] All peace-loving people are looking to Geneva hoping that the new negotiations on nuclear and space arms agreed upon by the USSR and the United States will bring about substantial results. The peoples are united by the urgent desire for an end to the mad arms race and by the conviction that it is possible to ban the danger of nuclear war. Throughout the world responsible politicians are working to improve the political climate and bring about a change in favor of peace on our planet.

FRG Government head Helmut Kohl has also made a statement. What he said to one of his country's journals is, however, in line with those who are obviously addicted to further escalating the arms race. H. Kohl glorifies the disastrous decision on the deployment of American first-strike weapons on the territory of the FRG as a steadfast attitude, and even as a "decision of the century." Hasn't Bonn said before that it wants to create peace with fewer and fewer weapons? Obviously, the FRG chancellor has not yet noticed that he is proving to be a liar.

His government's approval of the missile deployment was a decision that nearly 70 percent of FRG citizens opposed. Not only that, but it was a decision that was contrary to the peace interests of the peoples of Europe. It is not enough that it was justified with the "threat from the East"; it is now even being raised to the ranks of an initiative of historic significance. In truth, the deployment has resulted in more missiles but less security for the FRG population. More and more reasonable thinking people in this country realize that these are suicidal weapons and that the most important task is to complete this century, which has already seen two world wars, in peace and peaceful cooperation.

Now the question arises: How does Mr Kohl view this century? As a century of peace, or of an arms race. The peoples want peace and disarmament, not a policy that escalates the arms spiral further and further.

Moreover: What is one to think if a man who glorifies the further accumulation of mass destruction weapons in the European theatre speaks of alleged identity problems of the GDR.

No one on the Rhine needs to burden his mind over the identity of the GDR. History long ago decided that. In addition, in the international arena the identity between word and deed in the GDR's policy is highly appreciated.

As a state of workers and peasants, the GDR acts in accordance with its founding oath to do everything to prevent war from ever again emanating from German soil. This applies to the fulfillment of the Potsdam Agreement as well as to today's consistent peace policy. In this context our state is based on the power of the people, on the best humanist traditions of German history. It fulfills the legacy of the strugglers against fascism and war. Thanks to its policy, the GDR is today on the winning side of history.

By the way: Does he not suffer from identity problems who, in contrast to his allies, understands the defeat of German fascism and militarism as a catastrophe, and whose botchwork was founded on orders and administered to this day against the will of the people?

CSO: 5200/3019

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

U.S. 'DEMAGOGUERY' ON MX MISSILES CRITICIZED

LD210401 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 2210 GMT 21 Mar 85

[From the "World Panorama" program presented by Jan Gadomski and Andrzej Walasek]

[Excerpts] [Gadomski] We will begin with a dispatch from Brussels. Over to Andrzej Bilik.

[Begin recording] The Belgian Parliament, by a 116 to 93 vote has, in the end, given its vote of confidence to Prime Minister Martens' government on the issue of Euro-missiles. [end recording]

[Walasek] What has happened in Belgium is most clearly an element in a coordinated U.S. policy, since President Reagan has simultaneous with the Belgian decision, compelled his Senate to agree to the further financing of the construction of the MX intercontinental missiles. It is becoming increasingly clear that President Reagan perceives the Soviet-American talks in Geneva as an alibi for an armaments drive.

[Gadomski] Anyway, the President is certainly not making a secret of it. He arrived at Congress a few hours before the vote and made a personal appeal to hesitant senators to vote for allocating funds for the construction of the MX missiles. He said that voting against the missiles would be an expression of a lack of patriotism, a betrayal of U.S. national security interests, and an attempt to stick a knife in the back of the American delegation in Geneva.

[Walasek] Voting against the construction of new missiles will, according to President Reagan, weaken U.S. military strength and betray its European allies. Reagan said in conclusion that rejecting the MX missile's construction program will prevent the United States from conducting disarmament negotiations from a position of strength and a position of decisiveness.

[Gadomski] In view of such demagoguery it is surprising that little more than half of the senators voted for the MX missiles. The voting was 55 to 45. However, that is still more MX supporters than last year. Reagan's methods are effective, as we can see.

[Walasek] The MX missiles have a long history.

[Gadomski] We must say clearly that of course these are offensive missiles -- typical first-strike weapons. Together with the brutal forcing upon the Belgians of another obviously offensive system, the cruise missile, the U.S. Senate's decision makes a gloomy prelude to the Geneva dialogue. President Reagan's demagoguery changes nothing here; on the contrary, behind a screen of slogans it leads one to perceive a weakly disguised intention not to disarm but to achieve military superiority.

CSO: 5200/11

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

XINHUA ROUNDUP ON BELGIUM'S MISSILE DECISION

OW160937 Beijing XINHUA in English 0847 GMT 16 Mar 85

["Round-up: Belgium To Deploy U.S. Missiles--A Dramatic Move (by correspondent Liu Fangan)"]--XINHUA headline]

[Text] Brussels, 15 Mar (XINHUA)--Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens announced in parliament today that his government will deploy its first batch of 16 U.S. medium-range missiles this month.

This falls in with NATO's 1979 "dual decision" to begin deployment of the missiles in five West European countries, beginning in late 1983. So far, the U.S.-made Pershing-II and cruise missiles have been stationed in Federal Germany, Britain and Italy.

Under the "dual decision," Belgium was to begin deployment last March. But its government delayed a decision until today because of opposition from strong leftwing forces, peace groups and a divided government.

On the other hand, pressure had been mounting within NATO, urging Belgium to comply with the deployment plan, thus plunging it into a difficult situation.

To work its way out, the Belgian Government had been seeking a stop-gap device which would enable it to go along with its commitment and also pacify the mass opposition at home. Toward this end, Belgian Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans made a sweep of its allies' capitals early this year in a round of "consultative diplomacy" to win time for maneuvering.

However, a warning was served by the U.S. ambassador in Brussels that a delayed deployment would weaken the U.S. position in nuclear arms talks with the Soviet Union. Belgium's other allies, meanwhile, were unanimous in urging it to honor the agreed timetable to show allied "unity."

On the eve of the renewed arms control talks in Geneva, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko warned that if the deployment of U.S. missiles continued in Western Europe, an agreement at Geneva would be difficult to come by. Gromyko's warning was echoed in the local press, which feared that Belgium's announcement would affect progress at Geneva.

A NATO source, however, today said that the Belgian move will not affect the ongoing talks, since the Soviet Union already has taken "retaliatory" measures by increasing the number of its SS-20 missiles from 398 to 414. The number of increased Soviet missiles is exactly the same number of missiles (16) as Belgium is to install, according to NATO.

It was pointed out in the local press that the Belgian move today will cause widespread dissatisfaction on the eve of the general elections, and will incite peace groups.

The announcement also is expected to influence the Netherlands, the only NATO member yet to decide whether to deploy U.S. missiles by year's end.

CSO: 5200/4003

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BELGIAN DEMONSTRATORS PROTEST MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

OW180906 Beijing XINHUA in English 0639 GMT 18 Mar 85

[Text] Brussels, 17 Mar (XINHUA)--A crowd estimated at 50,000 held a peaceful rally this afternoon in the center of the capital against the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles on Belgian territory.

The Belgian Government had confirmed on the weekend that the first batch of 16 missiles with nuclear warheads were already installed on a military base at Florennes under a 1979 NATO plan.

Pacifists, ecologists, labor unions, non-governmental organizations and some political parties participated in the protest, which went off without incident.

Some of the demonstrators' slogans demanded "no new nuclear arms--neither in Belgium nor in the whole of Europe," a "denuclearized zone in Europe," and "the U.S.A. and USSR to freeze nuclear arms race." A wagon carried effigies of Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev.

The organizers declared at a press conference that the rally was to oppose the deployment of the missiles and to focus the responsibility for the deployment on the Belgian Parliament. The parliament is scheduled to debate the problem today.

Belgium is the fourth NATO member country to deploy American missiles in its territory after Britain, Federal Germany and Italy.

CSO: 5200-4003

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

PAPER COMMENTS ON COUNTRY'S STAND ON NORDIC ZONE

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 1 Mar 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Nuclear-Free Zone An Eternal Question -- What Happens Before?"]

[Text] The promotion of a Nordic nuclear-free zone has for a long time been a favorite project of Finnish foreign policy, it has become a central theme of the so-called foreign policy liturgy. For a long time we did not receive a favorable response from the other Nordic countries. The situation has changed in the minds of many in recent years. The project has generated a lively public debate in all the Nordic countries. Plans are now in the making for a special zone conference of Nordic parliamentarians.

Still, one fact has remained nearly unchanged: the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-free zone has not really come any closer to becoming a reality. This was demonstrated again by the speeches of political editors at the security seminar, in which the ambassadors of the Soviet Union, Sweden, and Norway participated together for the first time.

Our foreign policy leadership is, of course, aware of the state of affairs. At the same time the premise has justifiably been that our role does not include a submission to passiveness in security questions regarding our own immediate area. The continuing nuclear arms buildup and weapons technology developments of the super powers also create new threat scenarios on the periphery of the Nordic area.

In his New Year's day speech President Mauno Koivisto reiterated his predecessor's 1978 appeal to the nuclear powers for a ban or a limit on cruise missiles. Koivisto, however, did not go as far as President Kekkonen. At that time Kekkonen considered that in the name of their own interests the Nordic countries should enter into mutual negotiations or into negotiations on arms control with the super powers concerned. Koivisto's caution in giving advice to the other Nordic countries on understanding their own interests was certainly prudent since, for example, Sweden's Olof Palme was not even enthusiastic about Koivisto's cruise missile appeal.

Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen has given signs of readiness for greater initiative -- certain statements, which have aroused attention but have remained somewhat enigmatic, point to this. At the seminar of political editors, he

demanded an attempt as a continuation of a certain Stockholm conference to take actions going beyond the Nordic area to include the rest of Europe for strengthening confidence and security.

In a speech delivered in Stockholm a couple months ago Vayrynen considered that in addition to promoting a Nordic nuclear-free zone, the Nordic countries could try to find "such areas of military action in which the Nordic countries themselves as well as the leading super powers would have an interest for developing systems that would increase trust and security".

Vayrynen has not consented to spell out in concrete terms what he means by this. Presumably, he with reason is afraid of stepping on President Koivisto's toes; indeed the president has announced that the administration of foreign policy is his primary responsibility.

Vayrynen, who became impatient with the lack of prospects regarding the debate on a Nordic nuclear-free zone a couple years ago already, proposed in his capacity as the leader of the Center Party the establishment of a narrower nuclear-free zone in the Arctic area of the Nordic countries. In Vayrynen's opinion such a mini-zone could be an intermediate objective on the way toward the accomplishment of Kekkonen's original plan. The proposal, however, was said to be just as unrealistic as the original proposal and it was quickly forgotten.

This time there may be a different kind of substitute solution in the foreign minister's mind. The already existing voluntary obligations and practical measures, which the Nordic countries have adopted with respect to security policy on their own territory, could be assembled in a joint paper as its basis. Their number is already considerable.

Thus Denmark and Norway have refused to allow foreign troops and nuclear weapons on their territories in peacetime. Norway has placed numerous limits on NATO's and also its own military activities in the north in the vicinity of the Soviet border. Norway has also decided not to locate depots for NATO's heavy weaponry there. Finland, for its part, has proposed border peace systems with Norway in the north. Other such measures can be considered.

The time for making the proposals concrete may not be until the results of the Stockholm disarmament conference begin to be seen. At least at this point in time the other Nordic countries do not appear to be interested, which is understandable. Therefore, it is best even for Finland to wait and see -- as well as develop substitute proposals parallel to the eternal objectives.

10576

CSO: 3617/86

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

RENMIN RIBAO ON STOCKHOLM DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

HK250251 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 22 Mar 85 p 7

["Roundup" by RENMIN RIBAO reporter Liu Xumin: "A Difficult Meeting for Accomplishments"]

[Text] Stockholm, 21 Mar --- The fifth session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe concludes on 22 March. The next session will be held on 14 May. The Conference on Disarmament in Europe has been in session for more than 1 year, and people still are haggling over the agenda. So far nothing substantive has been discussed.

The fifth session began on 29 January. The United States and six other NATO members have successively put forward six working documents in order to explain in detail the six proposals put forward by NATO at the opening ceremony. In addition, on 8 March, they presented to the conference a general document with the following main points: exchange of information on military strength, advance notification of military exercises and troop movements (including those involving 6,000 men or more or 3,000 Marines or more), the mutual stationing of observers, on-the-spot verification, and the establishment of a "hotline" between the countries attending the conference.

It is reported that NATO has spent 6 years formulating these six proposals. The proposals suggest that military exercises and troop movements between the Atlantic and the Baltic should require advance notification. According to the Helsinki Final Act, military exercises and troop movements involving 25,000 men or more each should be reported in advance. However, the proposals have reduced the figure to 6,000 or more, thus arousing the resentment of the Soviet Union. The Soviet press has criticized the NATO countries for being enthusiastic about making specific military arrangements in an attempt to pry into the Soviet Union's military secrets, pin down its troops, and let the United States run wild.

Last year the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact members also put forward six proposals. They showed no interest in purely military measures. Instead, they suggested East and West should conclude a political treaty on abstaining from using force and from being the first to use nuclear weapons. The United States and the other NATO members are of the opinion that since the question of abstaining from using force was affirmed in the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act long ago, it would be pointless to discuss it again.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact members have not yet formally reacted to the offensive launched by NATO at the conference. It is reported that the Soviet negotiators have complained that although President Reagan announced that the West will discuss the major proposals put forward by the Soviet Union at the Stockholm conference, however, to date there has not been the slightest suggestion that the West sincerely wants to seriously discuss them.

The neutral and nonaligned countries have been very active at the conference. They have been trying their best to mediate between the two major blocs of East and West in the hope of a compromise that takes into account the military factors considered by NATO as well as the political features in the proposals put forward by the Warsaw Pact countries. Some countries are of the opinion that the two supplement each other. Without the guarantee provided by specific military and technical measures, a treaty on abstaining from using force will come to nothing in the end.

CSO: 5200/4012

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

POLISH DELEGATE ON USSR PROPOSAL, U.S. REACTION

LD301212 Warsaw PAP in English 1106 GMT 30 Jan 85

[By PAP special correspondent Andrzej Rayzacher]

[Text] Stockholm, Jan. 29 -- Supporting the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union on Monday at the first plenary meeting of the 5th session of the Stockholm conference, head of the Polish delegation Ambassador Wlodzimierz Konarski welcomed the announced resumption of the new U.S.-Soviet disarmament dialogue.

On Monday the Soviet Union presented guidelines for a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and maintenance of peaceful relations.

Ambassador Konarski said today:

"Alongside an improvement in East-West relations, the dialogue creates the necessary premises for building confidence and security in Europe. The current phase of the Stockholm conference starts in more favourable circumstances than last year, but our optimism is restricted by the experiences of recent years and by statements indicating that certain representatives of the American Administration do not give up the policy from the position of strength."

In this connection Ambassador Konarski referred to the recent statement by an independent commission for disarmament and security (the so-called Palme commission), to the effect that all attempts at building impenetrable defences against mass destruction weapons are chimerical and politically destabilizing.

There exist no technical means of complete protection against nuclear threat. An urgent political solution of the issue of nuclear armaments is possible and necessary, the ambassador said.

He added that although the hitherto outcome of the Stockholm conference is seen modest, the conference certainly has made a considerable contribution to the general improvement in the international atmosphere.

It might have been greater, had the U.S. and other NATO states given up the attempts at gaining one-sided advantages, and had they observed the requirement of respect for interests of security of all negotiating sides.

Attempts at gaining one-sided advantages by any of the sides stand no chance to meet with unanimous acceptance as required in the CSCE process. This is why taking the partners' interests into account is not only the matter of goodwill but also of simple common sense.

Both external and internal factors, Ambassador Konarski went on, create favourable conditions for a more concrete work of the conference. It is going to be helped by the Soviet proposal submitted on Monday containing the basic assumptions for the treaty on mutual non-use of military force and on peaceful relations of states taking part in the conference. These proposals constitute a significant step towards the resolution of this so crucial an issue for the conference.

CSO: 5200/14

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

ISRAELYAN CONTRASTS USSR, U.S. STANDS ON SPACE ARMS

TASS Correspondent

LD261959 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMt 26 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva March 26 TASS--TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports: The course of discussions on the prevention of an arms race in outer space at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament has borne out conclusively the pressing nature of the problem and the international community's interest in preserving space as a sphere of peaceful activities. Practically all delegations stressed the significance of the existing international agreements that limit the military uses of space and called for working out additional and effective measures to prevent the arms race from spreading to space. In this connection unanimous satisfaction was voiced with the start of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

At the same time most conferees expressed grave concern about American plans to militarize space, in particular President Reagan's "strategic defense initiative." The delegation from Sri Lanka stressed anxiety over the striving to continue and accelerate space arms programs.

Voicing alarm about the fate of the 1972 treaty on the limitation of ABM defense systems, the Swedish representative urged a ban on the development, testing and deployment of all kinds of space weaponry.

Statements by many nonaligned countries expressed worry about the situation that is taking shape. The representatives of socialist countries exposed American plans for "star wars."

It can thus be said that the delegations of the United States and some of its closest allies found themselves in virtual isolation.

Summing up the course of the discussions on the issue, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Israelyan, said that contrary to claims by the American side, the absolute majority of the attending delegations are aware that, far from being conducive to stronger peace, stability and international security, the U.S. "strategic defense initiative" may dramatically destabilize the situation, fuel the arms race in all directions and completely disorganize the process of limiting the arms race.

After recalling the USSR's principled and consistent stand on the issue, the Soviet representative said that his country's efforts are invariably directed at preventing the militarization of outer space and making certain that it will serve only peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union's latest concrete proposals on this score are fully in line with these efforts. By contrast, the American approach is geared to ensuring the widest possible use of space for military purposes and the start of another round of the arms race, including the nuclear race, and no tricks can conceal the fact that the plans to militarize outer space and the "strategic defense initiative" substantially increase the risk of outbreak of a nuclear war.

Moscow Radio

LD261828 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] The head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament has said action of the American star wars program will cause a runaway arms race. Viktor Israelyan noted at the forum that this American program is aimed at creating possibilities for dealing a first nuclear strike and getting away with it.

CSO: 5200/1060

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

GDR ENVOY ADDRESSES GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

AU220854 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 20 Feb 85 p 1

[Text] Geneva (ADN) -- All states, big and small alike, have the right and duty to contribute to ending the arms race and to eliminating the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction, Ambassador Dr Harald Rose, GDR representative at the Geneva disarmament conference, stated at the plenum of this body of 40 states on Tuesday, 19 February.

The speaker described the declaration of the six states at Delhi as an urgent and convincing appeal for halting the nuclear arms race and for disarmament. He pointed to the support expressed by Erich Honecker for the demands leveled in the document, as well as to the conviction of the leading GDR representative that it is not only urgently necessary but also possible to avert the danger of a nuclear war. Dr Rose presented the message addressed by Erich Honecker to the six heads of state or government respectively as an official document of the Geneva disarmament conference.

The GDR representative pointed out the readiness of the Warsaw Pact states, confirmed at the Berlin foreign ministers' conference to undertake radical steps for a limitation and elimination of all types of weapons.

The GDR welcomes the Soviet-American statement of 8 January on the opening of new negotiations. Forty years after the victory over Hitler fascism the lesson should not be forgotten, above all that all possible efforts for peace must be undertaken.

CSO: 5200/3024

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CSCE DELEGATE URGES CHEMICAL WEAPONS FREEZE

LD181906 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1730 GMT 18 Mar 85

[Text] Stockholm, 18 Mar (ADN) -- Initial steps toward freeing Europe from chemical weapons would be confidence- and security-building measures of the 'first order in the present situation. This was stressed today by Ambassador Dr Guenter Buehring, head of the GDR delegation to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. The conference should use the opportunity provided by its mandate to halt the escalation of chemical weapons, the GDR representative said.

He criticized NATO's objections to the proposal to free Europe from chemical weapons. He demonstrated that the creation of zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons along the dividing line between the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO would markedly reduce military confrontation. This was also the aim of agreed measures which should be negotiated and adopted in Stockholm.

CSO: 5200/3020

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

35TH SESSION OF VIENNA MBFR TALKS ENDS

Session Ends

LD281323 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Our correspondent Viktor Mikheyev reports from Vienna:

The 35th round of the Vienna Talks on Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe is ending in the Austrian capital today. During this round the Soviet Union submitted a draft of basic provisions of an agreement concerning an initial reduction of land forces and armaments in Central Europe by the Soviet Union and the United States and subsequent freeze of the level of armed forces and armaments by the sides in this region.

This constructive step was taken on behalf of the socialist countries, direct participants of the talks. Western participants of the talks limited themselves for the duration of the entire round to a repetition of the well-known Western position. NATO bloc member-states have continued to seek unilateral advantages for themselves, calculating to use the talks for their mercenary motives.

Delegates' Comments Reported

AU281443 Paris AFP in English 1434 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Vienna, 28 Mar (AFP)—Muted optimism from the West and an unusually conciliatory tone from the East bloc marked the end today of the 35th round of the talks here on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Europe (MBFR).

Speaking for the Warsaw Pact, Stanislaw Przygodzki of Poland said, "New prospects for a breakthrough" had been achieved with the pact's latest proposal for the withdrawal of 20,000 Soviet and 13,000 U.S. soldiers within 1 year from the signing of an agreement.

Jan Hein van der Mortel, leader of the Dutch delegation, said there had been "great progress" during the current session of the talks that aim at scaling down conventional forces in central Europe, in the way Warsaw Pact delegates had answered the West's queries about the proposal.

Mr Van der Mortel said Atlantic alliance members would individually "analyze and study" the proposition of the Warsaw Pact in order to achieve "genuine consensus" within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

But the Dutch negotiator was unable to suggest a date for NATO's response.

Mr Przygodzki's statement conspicuously left out traditional charges that NATO was "deliberately delaying the negotiations," merely stressing a need for a "serious, constructive and rapid response" to the pact's proposals.

The talks will resume on 23 May after the Easter holiday and ensuing mid-May celebrations in Vienna marking the 30th anniversary of the Austrian State Treaty ending the occupation of Austria by the four World War II allies.

Next Round Starts 23 May

LD281413 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Vienna March 28 TASS -- The final plenary meeting of a regular round of the Vienna Talks on the Mutual Reduction of the Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe has been held here. The head of the Polish delegation, S. Przygodzki, addressing the meeting, pointed out that the round's chief event was the submission by the socialist countries, direct participants in the talks, of a new proposal on the initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of the land troops and armaments in central Europe and the subsequent non-increase of the levels of the armed forces and armaments of the sides in that region.

He draw attention to the constructive and practical character of the initiative, directed at turning from words to deeds and starting the process of lowering the level of military confrontation. The Polish representative pointed out the need for achieving concrete results in the work of the Vienna forum, noting that the West should give a serious, constructive and timely response to the proposal advanced by the socialist countries.

The U.S. representative addressed the meeting on behalf of the NATO member states. His statement was reduced to the reiteration of the known Western position and did not in fact contain a reply to the proposals of the socialist nations.

The next round of the Vienna talks will be held from May 23 to July 11 this year.

CSO: 5200/1063

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. CHEMICAL ARMS PRODUCTION CONTRADICTS STANCE ON BAN

LD012315 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Text] The United States Defense Department has published a survey that calls for developing new types of chemical weapons and for increasing American stockpiles of chemical arms. Now comment by Viktor Olin:

The publication of the survey was timed to coincide with the administration's application for chemical weapons appropriations in the next fiscal year. But it would be naive to think that the chemical arms program is to be started from scratch. The chemical arsenal of the United States is now the largest in the world. The Americans have enough chemical weapons to destroy the world's population 50 times over, and those weapons are deployed both in the United States and other countries. The plans now are to renew and to almost double those arsenals.

Now how does this program of intensive chemical warfare preparations fit in with Washington's declared intention to work for a ban on chemical weapons? Facts show that the American-proposed draft for an international convention, far from blocking the chemical rearmament program of the United States actually supplements it in a very logical way. The convention is intended above all to ensure a loophole for the United States and its allies to start producing chemical weapons without any verification or control obstacles. The convention is not intended to apply to privately owned factories, and those manufacture a considerable share of agents that go into making chemical weapons. The draft does not ban the activities of interstate alliances developing and manufacturing chemical weapons, as the one currently comprising the United States, Britain, Canada and Australia. If only one member of that alliance should refuse to join the convention, that member would be free to manufacture chemical weapons both for itself and for the other partners. And finally, the American draft makes no provisions for verifying the production of the binary chemical weapons, and those are regarded as the primary element of the future chemical arsenal of the United States. Binary weapons are made up of two practically harmless agents, and it is only at the moment of being used that those agents combine to make a weapon, otherwise the two components are easily disguised as civilian products.

The United States chemical warfare schemes are attracting much attention and causing public protest because the Americans compromised themselves by using

chemical weapons in Vietnam. Those weapons affected millions of Vietnamese people and the American servicemen who handled them. Today other regions are exposed to the danger of aggression, particularly Central America. Instances of the United States using chemical weapons there have already been registered.

CSO: 5200/1053

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. 'CONSTANTLY VIOLATES' TOXIC WEAPONS CONVENTION

LD261837 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS--The United States constantly violates the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and on their destruction, said Professor Nikolay Antonov. He attended, as an expert of the Soviet delegation, a Geneva conference on the verification of the fulfillment of the convention by the countries--parties to it. He recalled in an interview with a TASS correspondent in connection with the decade of the entry into force of this document, that the Soviet Union was the main initiator and an active participant in drawing up and approving the convention and complies with its provisions. This cannot be said about the United States, he noted. Washington goes on conducting dangerous experiments in circumvention of the biological convention. Even at the time when the negotiations on total prohibition of biological weapons were near their successful fruition, the Pentagon did everything to prevent the curtailing of work in this field. The Pentagon transferred its main center for the development of the biological weapons from Fort Detrick (Maryland) to Dugway Army experimental range in Utah state in the hope to hide it in that desert area. However, information about it leaked into the press. A big staff from the biological laboratories in Fort Detrick and Pine Bluff (Arkansas) are at work at the experimental range. According to the information that leaked into the press, the United States also continues illegally to keep strains of particular deadly diseases and toxins for carrying out covert operations.

Professor Antonov recalled what a terrible trace the use by the U.S. Army of microtoxins during the Vietnam war had left. The Pentagon's experiments are no less dangerous for Americans themselves, the scientist stressed. The press reported that there were cases of mass poisoning of wild Canadian deer and caribou in the area of Dugway experimental range. Fifty wild horses also perished from an unknown disease there after drinking water from a spring. India has recently become a new victim to monstrous experiments. The United States tried to test in that country bacteriological warfare means. Under the cover of scientific aid, it brought into Andhra-Pradesh state seeds, infected with virus and meant for damaging India's major farm crops.

At present, said Nikolay Antonov, Washington continues to develop biological weapons. According to press reports, millions of dollars have been set aside in this fiscal year for the laboratories at Dugway experimental range. The threat to people, said Professor Antonov, will be preserved until work on biological weapons is ceased and its stocks are destroyed completely as is proposed by the Soviet Union and many other states.

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

DUTCH VIEW TACTICS, PROTECTION AGAINST CHEMICAL WARFARE

The Hague LEGERKOERIER in Dutch Jan 85 pp 28-29

[Text] There is general agreement that for the past 15 years the Soviet Union has kept up its production and development of chemical weapons. Most Western analysts assume that 30 percent of the artillery ammunition and 50 percent of rocket warheads of the Warsaw Pact armies contain chemical charges. The 1925 Geneva Protocol, however, forbade the employment of chemical weapons. But the protocol, signed by both the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, does not forbid the development of chemical weapons or the possession of the capability of chemical reprisals. An attempt is being made to attain a complete ban through international deliberations, but here again the stumbling block continues to be mutual inspection.

Going by Regulation Nr 3-755/1, NBC Defense Manual, we assume that chemical weapons include such things as "chemical compounds employed for the purpose of putting personnel out of combat action and also obstructing or hindering the utilization of terrain, installations or materiel."

In considering their effect chemical weapons can be subdivided into: lethal and incapacitating weapons. The lethal (death dealing) chemical weapons cause serious injury or death, depending on the quantity which is absorbed by the body. These include nerve paralyzers, vesicants, asphyxiating and cell poisoning weapons. Incapacitating weapons cause temporary (effects lasting for hours or days) derangement of body or mental functions as a result of which the victims are unable to carry out their tasks while they are under the influence of such weapons.

On the field these chemical weapons may occur in the forms of vapor (mostly invisible), aerosol (very fine molecules of solids or liquids present in the air) and liquids. The duration of contamination (the time in which a chemical weapon maintains a dangerous effect) is dependent on the specific characteristics of the weapon, the form of its diffusion, weather conditions and terrain features.

Nerve paralyzing weapons are differentiated into volatile and non-volatile types and generally they are colorless to light brown syrupy liquids which produce colorless and nearly odorless vapors. Because of their very high toxicity these weapons are extremely dangerous. Unless countermeasures are taken against them, if a lethal amount enters the body, the victim will die in 15 minutes. Because these weapons cannot be detected through sensory organs, unless means for detecting them are available, their presence is often discerned only when the symptoms of poisoning show up. Poisoning can occur by breathing in the vapor or the aerosol, absorption of the vapor or aerosol through the eyes and skin, or through the absorption of liquid through the eyes, skin and mouth.

Vesicant weapons are mostly colorless to dark brown oily liquids which emit a colorless vapor. Some of the vesicant weapons have a definite detectable odor. They evaporate slowly so that under certain conditions they can remain present for many days to weeks at the location where they are scattered. Vesicant weapons derive their name from the blisters causing action which can ultimately lead to the total destruction of tissues (in eyes, skin and lungs). The eyes are the most prone to vesicant weapons. These can be differentiated into mustard gases, arsenic compounds and oximes. Poisoning can result from breathing the vapor or aerosol, absorption of the vapor or aerosol through the eyes and skin and absorption of liquids through the eyes, skin and mouth.

Asphyxiating weapons consist of gases, to be sure very fast evaporizing liquids, and therefore these have only a brief period of effectiveness at the area of dispersion. Asphyxiating weapons derive their name from the effect they have on the respiratory organs. The lung tissues are damaged when the gases are inhaled. When this happens the function of the lungs becomes so poor as to cause a shortage of oxygen and a surplus of carbon dioxide in the blood. The most prevalent representative groups of these are the phosgenes and diphosgenes.

Poisoning occurs when the vapor is inhaled. In its vapor form it can, at the same time, cause eye irritation and in liquid form severe damage to the eyes.

Cell poisoning weapons consist of rapidly evaporizing liquids which, because of this factor, have a brief period of effectiveness at the area of dispersion. Cell poisoning weapons disrupt the production of energy within the cells. In sensitive cells such as those of the brain, heart and to a lesser extent muscles, this lack of energy can have fatal consequences within seconds to minutes. The most important representatives of this group are prussic acid and chlorine cyanogen. Poisoning occurs mostly through the inhalation of the vapor.

Incapacitating weapons are dispersed in the field as an aerosol and as such they have a brief period of effectiveness in the area of dispersion. These are materials that affect the central nervous system of humans and consequently they disrupt normal functioning, without affecting the physiological processes. The resulting nervous disorders are of a temporary nature. LSD is an example of this kind of weapon. Poisoning is usually caused by inhalation.

Input

It is possible to achieve the objectives of chemical weapons in the most effective form, in the desired quantity and at the selected timing with the help of mortars, howitzers, multitube rocket launchers, guided missiles and unguided rockets, land mines, jet fighters, bombers and helicopters. Chemical weapons can be employed both against objectives in the combat zone and against military objectives situated farther away such as ports, airfields, depots and supplies, road intersections in supply lines, or against objectives that are not directly connected with military operations such as industrial centers.

Loss of Effectiveness

According to Lieutenant Colonel G. J. V. A. Gommers, the commandant of the NBC-School, a purposeful chemical weapons attack on company size military units is already possible. The effect would also be sufficiently great in a conventional artillery duel in which a few chemical shells would also be fired. Taking the utmost protective measures will therefore become imperative. However, this is something which is always attended by the loss of effectiveness in exercising one's functions, depending on the degree of one's fitness.

A certain level of protective measures, in line with the degree of threat to a certain area, would then have to be announced. If the input of chemical weapons is expected the commandant will then also give orders for instituting preventive measures. This sort of protection is also attained by the wearing of personnel protective clothing and the gas mask. In the first phase, for example, the order could be given to put on the NBC-hood so as to prevent the inhalation of a chemical weapon in the course of a possible attack while the gas mask has not yet been put in place.

Not a Bad Showing

According to Major E. L. A. Kersing, chief of the NBC-School's advisory and instructions section, the present NBC-clothing now available to army corps units is calculated to protect military personnel for 24 hours. Going by his international contacts in this respect he has expressed the opinion that, within NATO, we have not made a bad showing with our protective NBC-clothing. But problems do arise in maintaining skills after the first training session is over.

Major Kersing said: "Chemical warfare will always be troublesome with respect to location, timing and extent. The effect of a chemical weapon will be the same on a soldier and on a general. Therefore I think that every military person in the Royal Land Forces must know and be familiar with what to do with the means made available to him or to her during an attack with chemical weapons. That is the condition for survival."

7964

CSO: 5200/2508

23 April 1985

ITALY VIEWS DEVELOPMENT, POSSESSION, USE OF CB WEAPONS

Naples IL MATTINO in Italian 18 Feb 85 p 8

[Article by Almerico Di Meglio: "Yellow Rain on the East Winds"]

[Text] Chemical warfare scenarios: according to Prof Schwartzstein, Soviet escalation in readying bacterial and biological weapons for use against civilian populations is the greatest menace threatening all Western countries today.

Last May in Geneva, U.S. Vice President George Bush proposed a ban on all chemical weapons. In so doing, he voiced the apprehension of all the Western powers at the tremendous buildup of this kind of weaponry in the Soviet Union, in violation of international agreements to which it is a party. Moscow, however, balked at the measures vital to verification of compliance with such an agreement, should it be reached. "Encroachment on national sovereignty" is the Russians' standard reply to any agreement, designed to nip any such attempt in the bud: what validity would there be in a treaty with which there could be no verification of compliance? This means that we are sliding toward another arms race, even as the Geneva negotiations continue. Barring unforeseen and frankly unlikely changes of attitudes, those negotiations seem destined to wind up looking very much like the ongoing talks in Vienna on conventional weapons (MBFR): oral arguments among the deaf. Meanwhile, as we saw in the preceding article, the buildup of so-called "third-generation" chemical weapons continues, even as we contemplate the dreadful prospects opened before us by genetic engineering. Western experts are worried: the NATO countries are spending very little on research, whereas the fundamental problem for an alliance based on defense must be identification of new chemical weapons so as to be in a position to defend itself against them and, consequently, to render them useless in the hands of the adversary.

Be that as it may, the massive Soviet buildup is shaking the foundations of the 1972 agreement (signed in Moscow, London, and Washington) which called for a ban on stockpiling bacteriological and toxic weapons and on their distribution.

"Along about the mid-Seventies," says Schwartzstein, one of the top American experts, "there were a lot of conservatives who felt that the international community had just about established an international legal system designed effectively to rid the world of the threat of chemical and biological weapons, and that all this meant that the world had taken a step forward affirmation of those vital humanitarian principles upon which the system was based.

"But, as the Seventies passed into history," Schwartzstein adds, "that optimism was slowly corroded as the steady flow of reliable reports from Southeast Asia on the use of chemical weapons, subsequently known as "yellow rain," began filtering in from Afghanistan. In 1980, the UN decided that the reports were disquieting enough to warrant an investigation. The violent arguments that ensued are to be credited with triggering interest among the general public on a matter that thereto had very often been found distasteful and therefore generally ignored.

"However," Schwartzstein emphasizes, "waiting for a general consensus to be reached on the findings of the inquiry, a consummation that might never have come to pass, for various reasons, ran the risk of turning into a senseless loss of human lives, yet more suffering, and yet more disrespect for the laws. When it comes to managing international affairs, wars, protecting civilian populations, or settling domestic problems, the level of urgency is such that the degree of certainty obligatory for the scientist cannot always be achieved. The use of prohibited weapons is certainly one example of the problems that frequently call for a decision based on evidence that might leave the scientist not completely satisfied. However, the risk involved in withholding judgment is considerably worse."

The fact is that, while the refusal to permit on-site investigation makes it more difficult for international organizations to come by hard evidence, the use of chemical weapons seems destined to have increasing impact on civilian populations.

"To those who use these weapons," says Schwartzstein, "sowing terror and panic is highly advantageous, militarily speaking. Some governments use them to force the mass exodus of "undesirable population masses. That is what is happening now in Afghanistan, Laos, and Cambodia."

Not by coincidence, of the 4 million or so Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran, almost all belong to the nationality that is predominant and most committed to the resistance. In Laos, it is the "tribes" that live in the mountains and which are most jealous of their traditions that are hardest hit. In Cambodia it is the people living in the border regions who are being forced

into exile, partly in order to make room for the thousands of civilians Hanoi has driven there to colonize the country, to "denationalize" the people, and "normalize" the domination that has depended hitherto on force of arms.

In short, chemical weapons, "especially when used against civilian populations," says Schwartzstein, "when the victims are not soldiers, but women, old people, and children, those least able to defend themselves," prove to be the ultimate weapons of fear. And they are used to drive the people out of territories controlled by the "rebels," thereby inflicting heavy damages on the resistance both militarily, by depriving it of support from the people, and politically, by depriving it of its status as representative of the people. These are the same considerations that are driving the Ethiopian regime, as well, to use them in Tigre (where, however, the main cause of the exodus is hunger, some of it actually engineered).

Yet, although chemical rearmament is still being discussed in the West in hypothetical terms of re-establishing an already discredited "deterrence," L'EXPRESS says, "the experts know perfectly well that the newly acquired knowledge of cellular and molecular behavior have touched off the "chemical escalation" again and that all the armed forces are busy, in the deepest secrecy, at inventing defenses against chemical and bacteriological weapons." Some fifteen countries, almost all of them in the Third World, have in recent years armed themselves with chemical and biological weapons of both first and second generations. Yet the only such major arsenals listed by the prestigious Swedish Sipri Institute are the Soviet, the American, and the French. The Russians have built up a stockpile of "120,000 tons of toxic agents, plus several hundreds of thousands of tons of chemical weapons, ranging from poison gases from WW I to the latest neurotoxins. These weapons have reportedly been distributed to warehouses in East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. In addition, the Soviets have formed a special corps trained in such matters, some 100,000 strong.

As for the United States, although it destroyed its arsenals of bacteriological weapons after signing the 1972 convention, now "has 38 tons of poison gases," only half of which consists of neurotoxins: a large portion of this, however, is probably obsolete and unusable because of poor stocking practices. Most of this arsenal is in the United States and in only two abroad: one in Europe (West Germany), and the other on Johnston Island in the Pacific. The U.S. Congress refused to approve manufacture of a "binary gas" consisting of two chemical compounds which are not very toxic alone, but which would mix while the bomb sped toward its target to form a lethal compound."

As for France, its arsenal is more than modest (several hundred tons of gas), but at least it can boast some reprisal capability in case of attack, in line with its defense strategy. In any case, as shown by our interview with Gen Etienne Coppel, the debate on the issue of chemical defensive weapons in France is now in full swing. It is running just as high in England, which has already put the Soviets on notice that it will replace the chemical weapons it destroyed if they continue to develop new ones. Since the Sverdlovsk "incident" in the Urals, which reportedly inflicted more than 10,000 casualties, it is increasingly hard for the Soviets to go on denying known facts.

6182

CS0: 8028/1118

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SED, SPD OFFICIALS RESUME CHEMICAL WEAPONS TALKS

Bonn Meeting

LD281753 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1515 GMT 28 Feb 85

[Text] Bonn, 28 Feb (ADN) -- Members of the SED Central Committee and the SPD Executive Committee in Bonn on Thursday 28 February continued the talks they started in July 1984 on questions concerning banning chemical weapons and creating a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe.

Taking part on the SED side were: Hermann Axen, Politburo member and secretary of the SED Central Committee; Gunter Rettner, department head of the International Politics and Economics Department; Manfred Uschner, deputy department head of the SED Central Committee; and Professor Karlheinz Lohs, director of the Chemical Toxicology Research Department in the GDR Academy of Sciences. On the SPD side: Egon Bahr, member of the Presidium of the SPD Executive Committee and member of the Bundestag; Karsten D. Voigt, member of the SPD Bundestag Group Executive Committee; and Hermann Scheer, Bundestag deputy. The talks are taking place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

The SED representatives were received at Cologne-Bonn airport by Karsten D. Voigt, Ambassador Ewald Moldt, head of the GDR's Permanent Mission in the FRG, and other public figures.

Dr Hans-Jochen Vogel, deputy chairman of the SPD and chairman of the SPD Bundestag Group, met Hermann Axen for a talk on Thursday. Hermann Axen conveyed greetings from Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, which were cordially reciprocated.

In the talk, questions on the struggle for safeguarding peace, particularly the consultations between the SED and the SPD with respect to ridding Europe of chemical weapons, were discussed. Hermann Axen and Hans-Jochen Vogel exchanged views on current international problems. The talks proceeded in a businesslike and frank atmosphere.

'Significant Advances' Reported

LD011125 Hamburg DPA in German 1039 GMT 1 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 1 Mar (DPA) -- SPD and SED politicians announced in Bonn today that constructive results and "significant advances" have been made in their talks on chemical weapons disarmament. SED Politburo member Hermann Axen, head of the SED delegation, was subsequently received by Federal Foreign Minister Genscher for an exchange of views. Axen will also visit the Federal Chancellor's Office at the invitation of Minister of State Wolfgang Schaeuble.

At a news conference held at the Friedrich-Ebert Foundation headquarters, Axen again stressed the "very businesslike, very constructive and very responsible-minded atmosphere" of the talks, which were attended by SPD politicians Egon Bahr, Karsten Voigt and Hermann Scheer. Axen spoke of "important advances in the realization of our task to work out proposals for freeing Europe from chemical weapons." Without mentioning details, he spoke of the joint solution of complex, major issues, while the details of problems still had to be clarified. He announced a "positive response" from East Berlin.

Voigt, who is to brief the Federal Chancellor's Office, announced results which could be a basis for government negotiations. This fourth round of talks and their improved and more open atmosphere have shown the mutual interest in reaching agreements.

CSO: 5200/3021

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. PRODUCTION OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS ASSAILED

DW141500 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1210 GMT 14 Mar 85

[Retired Colonel Wolfgang Lehmann commentary]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, addressing the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, has demanded initiatives aimed at curbing the proliferation of chemical weapons. This is quite an honorable venture, considering that as late as in 1963 merely five states had chemical combat agents whereas, reportedly, the number is now 13.

We need only take a closer look to see that this problem becomes rather marginal compared with the current production of chemical weapons in states with significant military potential, such as the United States, and compared with the stockpiles of immediately usable chemical munitions already present in potential NATO war theaters in West Europe in general, and in the FRG in particular. These truly are the crucial problems, because scientists say that the existing stockpiles of the agents of silent death are sufficient to eradicate all mankind. The London journal SURVIVAL disclosed that a single Phantom plane equipped with nerve gas could represent a mass destruction weapon which would be comparable to a small nuclear weapon in its killing capacity.

As for the production of chemical agents, very alarming developments have recently occurred in the United States. The protagonists of the military-industrial complex once again are working on the specter of another gap. This time it is chemical weapons that are reportedly in short supply. This is why the Pentagon is pestering Congress with the demand that more than \$20 billion be appropriated for that purpose in 1985 -- 10 times more than in 1978. The chemical weapon arsenal of the United States is supposed to be enlarged from three to five million units. The toxic effect of the weapons is reportedly to increase to about a thousand times that of the known nerve-damaging agents.

New, binary agents are being produced. Their basic concept is to keep separate during the transport and storage stage the individual components which, compared with the final product, have a relatively minor toxic effect. Only after the weapon is discharged, or at the beginning of the spraying process, is the reaction set off which produces the lethal agent. Among other things, this makes it possible to largely camouflage the level of chemical armament and to make disarmament control difficult.

The large-scale production of the binary chemical munitions in the death factory at [place indistinct] in Arkansas has been cranked up and is to be implemented within 7 years in accordance with a four-stage plan.

It is generally known that the Warsaw Pact states in their political declaration of 5 January 1983 demanded that the preparation of an international convention on the ban and the destruction of chemical weapons be accelerated. The reaction of the United States was negative. In fact, it had cut off bilateral Soviet-U.S. negotiations on the issue back in 1980. This, however, would offer a true field of activity for the curbing of the chemical weapons proliferation! Therefore, it probably is not wrong to react to the remarks quoted in the beginning with the proverb: Here is where you should prove what you can do.

The situation is about the same with respect to the stockpiling of chemical munitions by the United States in foreign countries.

CSO: 5200/3021

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

REPORTAGE ON NEW ZEALAND SHIP BAN, ANZUS ROW

Lange Says 'Pressure' Prompts U.S.-USSR Talks

Christchurch THE PRESS in English 2 Jan 85 p 4

[Text]

Canberra
New Zealand did not seek to have a strike capacity or to be defended by nuclear weapons, said the Prime Minister, Mr Lange, yesterday.

"We are not going to have nuclear weapons in New Zealand and we are not going to learn to love the bomb," he said on Channel Nine's television programme, "Today."

He said the United States had assured New Zealand that it would not impose trade or economic sanctions over the nuclear ships issue, and he had told the Americans that the New Zealand policy was not directed against the American Navy.

Mr Lange said conventional vessels would be welcome.

He added that New Zealand would not change its opposition to visits by nuclear armed or powered ships.

Pressure for nuclear disarmament and de-escalation of the arms race had

become so powerful it had finally brought the Soviets and the Americans to the negotiating table, he said.

"It would be an awful irony if at the time when the climate for running armaments down is just building up, my Government should decide to change its stance and welcome nuclear weapons to New Zealand," he said. "The Government simply is not going to do that."

Mr Lange said he believed that Australia understood New Zealand's position on A.N.Z.U.S., just as New Zealand understood Australia's position.

New Zealand had a different history, he said. Australia had a different defence structure and had bases from other countries, he said.

"I don't expect them to conform to our position but I know that they will be anxious to talk with us, in their own right as Australia, and not as some messenger of another country," he said.

Nakasone Urges Lange To Reconsider

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 26 Jan 85 pp 1, 10

[Article by David Jenkins]

[Text]

Mr Hawks is the second prime minister in a week to urge the New Zealand Government to reconsider its hard-line stance on visits by nuclear-armed US warships.

"When the Japanese Prime Minister, Mr Yasuhiro Nakasone, visited Wellington last week he conveyed his private concerns to Mr Lange over the standoff over ship

visits.

The matter was not raised at the formal talks between the two leaders.

However, the Japanese leader made his feelings clear in private meetings with Mr Lange, albeit in a tactful and diplomatic manner. Senior officials travelling with Mr Nakasone underscored Tokyo's concerns.

Mr Nakasone indicated that from Japan's point of view the security of the Western Pacific was of great importance and that in the South Pacific ANZUS provided security against a growing Soviet military presence. Japan was concerned about anything that might affect the status quo.

One view put to the Lange Government during the Nakasone visit was that both the Japanese and the New Zealanders were allies of the United States and Tokyo did not want anything to disturb that.

"The point was made," a source told the *Herald*, "that with the nuclear arms limitation talks about to get under way in Geneva it was important for the Western nations to stick together, to convey the sense that the Western nations were indivisible and would regard as undesirable anything that would weaken the Western alliance."

If the Soviet Union felt that the Western camp was starting to fall apart Moscow would feel encouraged to be less forthcoming in the arms talks.

"That," said this source, "is the view they put, although not in so many words."

"They feel comfortable with the present arrangement and are very happy with ANZUS and would be unhappy if ANZUS fell apart."

The Japanese also made it clear to the New Zealanders that they did not want to see Wellington "turn down requests from America for ships to visit New Zealand ports".

The reasoning here was that if a ship which had been rejected by Wellington later turned up in Japan "people in Japan would be watching it very closely". At the same time, the Japanese press had often made the point "that if New Zealand were to pick and choose some Japanese might ask 'Why can't we pick and choose?'"

The Japanese have always been fascinated with the way other allies conduct their relations with the US.

When the Fraser Government was negotiating with Washington over the question of B-52 flights through Darwin, the Japanese wanted to know if Australia was likely to get any better guarantees than they had obtained from the Americans on the possible transport of nuclear weapons through their territory.

Second, they were concerned over the possibility that any undertaking made by the Americans might impair Washington's ability to move its focus about the globe.

Of these, the first point interested them most, largely because the ruling Liberal Democratic Party was concerned over possible opposition pressure if it could be shown that Australia had obtained better guarantees than Japan on the nuclear weapons issue.

Japan has firmly committed itself to three non-nuclear principles — not to make, possess or allow nuclear weapons on Japanese soil.

However, US warships, many of them known to be armed with nuclear weapons, call regularly at Japanese ports and others, such as the aircraft carrier USS Midway, are home-ported at Yokosuka, at the mouth of Tokyo Bay.

Tokyo's formal position — one which official spokesmen adhere to most punctiliously — is that the US has given an undertaking that any deployment of nuclear weapons in Japanese territory would be subject to prior consultations under the 1960 Mutual Security Treaty.

And, they say, as long as the Americans have not sought prior consultations that indicates, technically, that no nuclear weapons are aboard the US Navy ships that are either home-ported in Japan or which regularly call at Japanese ports.

In practice, of course, the Japanese do not choose to inquire too closely about the sort of weapons carried on these vessels.

It is no secret to Japanese defence planners that all of Washington's 14 aircraft carriers, including the Midway, are nuclear-armed. They also know that most of its cruisers, many of its destroyers and even some of its destroyer escorts also carry nuclear weapons.

Australian Left Opposes Hawke Pressure

Sydney THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD in English 26 Jan 85 pp 1, 10

[Article by Rod Frail]

[Text]

CANBERRA: The Labor Party's Left wing is preparing for a major confrontation with the Prime Minister over what it sees as his bald attempt to pressure New Zealand into dropping its ban on US nuclear warships.

Left wing anger follows the disclosure yesterday of details of a letter Mr Hawke sent to the NZ Prime Minister, Mr Lange, on the ban's implications for the ANZUS Treaty.

The Left sees the letter as unwarranted interference by Mr Hawke in the affairs of another country. It plans to bring the matter to a head when Caucus meets next month.

In Christchurch last night, NZ's Acting Prime Minister, Mr Palmer, said his country would not buckle from its anti-nuclear stance, despite "friendly persuasion" from its allies in Anzus.

He regretted the release of the Hawke letter "because it appears to place public pressure on the NZ Government" which had been "scrupulous in not making public statements about the Australian position".

While Mr Hawke's letter had set out the Australian policy, "the policy of the NZ Government is different; our anti-nuclear stance will not be altered by the letter.

"We will not be deflected from our policy. And no amount of friendly persuasion from our friends will cause us to deviate from our policy.

"There will be no ships carrying nuclear weapons in NZ ports while this government is in office. NZ is a small country. It does not carry a big stick. But our stand is one of principle. It will be resolutely maintained."

NZ remained committed to the Anzus pact "and our Anzus allies — but we will not bend to their wishes when our policies are so clearly established and so firmly held.

"Some in NZ fear the government will buckle. I assure them it

will not."

In his statement yesterday, Mr Hawke confirmed he had written to Mr Lange on January 10 — after talking with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Hayden and the Minister for Defence, Mr Beazley — strongly reaffirming Australia's commitment to ANZUS and to visits by US warships.

He had told Mr Lange he would value his thoughts on ANZUS before visiting Washington. He had no wish to act as an emissary for the United States.

Mr Hawke said Australia would be avoiding any public statements casting doubt on US policy of neither confirming nor denying if particular ships were nuclear armed or powered.

Australia, as NZ's alliance partner, saw it as important "that the NZ Government should do the same."

Australia "could not accept as a permanent arrangement that the ANZUS alliance had a different meaning, and entailed different obligations, for different members."

A prominent Victorian left-winger, Mr Peter Milton, said last night he had spoken widely with factional colleagues and had sent a telex to the Prime Minister saying he was appalled at his action.

His telex was supported by three other left-wing MPs, Senator Gordon McIntosh of WA, John Scott (Hindmarsh, SA) and Lewis Kent (Hotham, Vic).

"I think the mood of the Left is one of anger," he said.

"It is questionable for an Australian Prime Minister to interfere in the affairs of another country at any time, but to do it when there is so much division within the party on the matter is unforgivable."

The Left is doubly incensed by the government's apparent concessions to the Western Australian Government, allowing a watering down of the party

platform on land rights.

It is expected to meet in Canberra late next week to discuss these two issues and unease over the tight rein on public spending likely to accompany the "economic-trilogy" promises made by Mr Hawke.

Mr Milton said the Prime Minister's promise at the first Caucus meeting after the election — that there would be more consultation with backbenchers — seemed to have gone by the board.

"It is the same old style government being run by a small coterie of half a dozen ministers."

The government could be thrown out of office at the next election if there were not more consultation with rank and file supporters.

A member of the NSW Left, Mr Robert Tickner (Hughes) said he had sent a telegram to Mr Lange, reaffirming his own commitment to the Australian Government's policy of non-interference in the New Zealand Government's decision.

"I am horrified at media reports which imply that Australia is moving to undermine that principle position," he said.

However, government sources insisted last night that the letter was sent at Mr Hawke's own initiative, not because of any prompting by the US.

ANZUS was expected to head the agenda in talks between Mr Hawke and US officials when he goes to the US next week.

The National Times which first reported the Hawke letter,

noted that it appeared at odds with Mr Hayden's earlier assurances that Australia would not be a "messenger boy" for the US and that Mr Lange had not appreciated Mr Hawke's intervention.

In his statement, Mr Hawke said he was concerned at false, misleading and damaging reports about his letter and, while he would not release the text, he outlined what was in it.

The letter informed Mr Lange he would be visiting the United States in early February for talks with President Reagan and expected the Americans would want to discuss in some depth the prospects for the ANZUS Alliance.

"I informed Mr Lange that in developing views for my talks in Washington I would value his thoughts on ANZUS and, in particular, on the longer term management of the question of ship visits."

"I stressed that I had no wish or intention to act in any way as an emissary. But I knew that the New Zealand and United States Governments had had a number of bilateral exchanges on the subject, and that it would be helpful to have his judgement on where the matter now stood and the prospects of an agreed outcome," Mr Hawke said.

In Wellington last night, 50 demonstrators gathered outside the Australian High Commission to protest about what they said was Australian government intervention in NZ domestic policies.

The demonstration was peaceful.

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

CANBERRA REACTION TO FAILURE OF UN NUCLEAR FREE PANEL

Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 11 Feb 85 p 4

[Text]

UNITED NATIONS, Feb 10. — A two-year attempt to increase the number of designated nuclear-free zones has ended in total failure and the United Nations panel that sought the accord will be disbanded, officials said yesterday.

Bhaichand Patel, secretary to the 21-nation group that included all five nuclear powers, said the aim was to establish non-nuclear zones in the Middle East, the Balkans, Northern Europe, Africa, South Asia and the South Pacific.

"They could not reach a consensus and, for the first time to my knowledge, the secretary-general will not be receiving a report from a group that he set up," Mr Patel said.

He indicated that difficulties which arose in the group's latest three-week, closed-door discussions came not from the major powers, but from such members as India and Argentina, both of which are said to have a nuclear potential.

"They believe the whole thing is unrealistic, a side-show," Mr Patel, who is from Fiji, told Reuters.

In Canberra, the Australian Foreign Affairs Department said the work of the South Pacific Forum group looking at setting up a nuclear-free zone in the region would not be affected by the failure of the UN panel to establish principles for a zone.

A senior spokesman said Australia was waiting for the head of its nuclear disarmament division, Mr Ron Walker, to confirm reports that the panel could not reach consensus.

Australia would be disappointed but not surprised, the spokesman said. "It was always known it was going to be a difficult task," he said.

The Foreign Affairs Department said last week the working group set up by the South Pacific Forum to examine the issues involved in establishing a nuclear-free zone in the region had made good progress following a four-day meeting in Canberra.

It is due to meet again in New Zealand in April, and report to a Pacific Forum heads of government meeting in Rarotonga in August.

The UN Secretary-General, Mr Javier Perez de Cuellar, who is in New Zealand, spoke earlier in the weekend of Latin America's nuclear-free zone treaty.

Latin America was very proud of its treaty declaring the whole hemisphere a non-nuclear area, he said. Only two countries had failed to sign it.

"We think this non-nuclear treaty is a good example to all the areas of the world. The United Nations philosophically supports non-nuclear areas."

The subject of the South Pacific's proposed nuclear-free zone and Anzus is likely to be raised when Mr Perez de Cuellar meets Mr Lange this afternoon.

Mr Perez de Cuellar said individual countries were to blame if UN decisions could not be implemented. — NZPA-AAP. Reuter.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

9 MAY 85